Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1914

THE VERDICT AT THE POLLS

BY THE EDITOR

It was a characteristic American verdict epitomized in the classic phrase of the Farthest West:

"Not guilty; but don't do it again!"

The Administration was not repudiated at the polls on November 3rd; it was sustained; it was not even effectively rebuked; but it was unmistakably warned. We still adhere to our declaration in the October number of this Review that the return of a Democratic House of Representatives, under the existing distressful conditions, would "signalize the most striking personal triumph of any President since Andrew Jackson overwhelmed the opposition in 1832," but in all candor we have to confess that another such victory might prove embarrassing to the party in power.

As usual, everybody is satisfied. President Wilson calmly and justifiably accepts the increased Democratic majority in the Senate and the reduced Democratic majority in the House as an indorsement; Mr. Taft is "reconciled" to the smashing repudiation of the First and Only Chief of the disappearing Recessives; Mr. Roosevelt, again emulating Mr. Bryan, reverts philosophically for consolation to the Scriptures; Mr. Bryan himself—but we will pass Mr. Bryan for the moment. Let us turn from the exponents of the higher statesmanship to the wise men of politics.

Copyright, 1914, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARTISAN INTERPRETATIONS

First appears upon the scene from the Ferry of Dobbs, rubbing his eyes, Mr. Charles D. Hilles, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, under whose dexterous guidance Mr. Taft triumphantly carried Utah and Vermont in 1912. To his enraptured vision the result in 1916 is not merely foreshadowed; it is become a positive certainty. Not even an earthquake can prevent the Republican party from resuming full control of the government for another fifty years. Let us see. Conceding the possibility—and it is at least that—of the election of a Republican President and a Republican House of Representatives, what of the Senate? To obtain control of that essential factor, the Republicans must gain at least seven seats. Assuming somewhat optimistically that they hold California, Delaware, Michigan, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin in addition to Connecticut, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming, they must still supplant seven Democrats. Assuming further and quite reasonably, we should say, that they can hardly expect to carry Arizona, Florida, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Tennessee, Texas, or Virginia, there remain Indiana, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia—eight in all. If Mr. Hilles really believes, in view of the very recent Democratic gain of three Senators, that his party can win over seven of these States and lose not one of those now held, we frankly have to confess a deeper respect for his wish than for his thought. Whatever else may happen, "complete control by the Republican party in 1917" is a mirage, to be mistaken for reality only by a hopeful Rip Van Winkle fresh from the Ferry of Dobbs.

Then comes Mr. Thomas J. Pence, Vice-Chairman-in-Charge of the Democratic National Committee, who finds himself quite unable to confirm the interpretation of Mr. Hilles. On the contrary, says Mr. Pence after due reflection, it was a marvelous Democratic victory, presaging overwhelming success in 1916. Better yet, he proves his assertion from figures—real numerals taken directly from the tables of addition and subtraction. If, says Mr. Pence, if—how we hate that intrusive monosyllable!—if it had been a Presidential election, "the Democracy would have had nearly one hundred majority in the Electoral College," to wit:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRATIC STATES

Alabama, 12.	Kentucky, 13.	Mississippi, 10.	South Carolina, 9.
Arizona, 3.	Louisiana, 10.	Missouri, 18.	South Dakota, 5.
Arkansas, 9.	New Mexico, 3.	Montana, 4.	Tennessee, 12.
California, 13.	Maine, 6.	Nebraska, 8.	Texas, 20.
Colorado, 6.	Maryland, 8.	Nevada, 3.	Virginia, 12.
Florida, 6.	Massachusetts, 18.	North Carolina, 12.	Wisconsin, 13.
Georgia, 14.	Michigan, 15.	Oklahoma, 10.	Wyoming, 3.
Indiana, 15.	Minnesota, 12.	Oregon, 5.	

Total, 307.

REPUBLICAN STATES

Connecticut, 7.	Iowa, 13.	New York, 45.	Rhode Island, 5.
Delaware, 3.	Kansas, 10.	North Dakota, 5.	Vermont, 4.
Idaho, 4.	New Hampshire, 4.	Ohio, 24.	Washington, 7.
Illinois, 29.	New Jersey, 14.	Pennsylvania, 38.	West Virginia, 8.

Total, 220.

DOUBTFUL

Utah, 4.

Leaving the ever morally doubtful Utah out of the calculation, this mathematical deduction provides a clear Democratic majority of eighty-seven—a wholly sufficient number, even though materially less than the more comfortable margin of 339 in 1912. But again, for the sake of natural curiosity, with Mr. Pence as with Mr. Hilles, let us analyze. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas? Yes. California? How about that pernickety, dissociated commonwealth, with Governor Hiram re-elected and eight Republican Representatives out of eleven? Let California stand aside for a moment. Massachusetts, too, with twelve Republican Representatives to four Democrats, and a total Republican plurality of nearly 40,000; and Maine, with three to one; and Minnesota, with eight to one; and Wisconsin, with eight to three; and Michigan, with eleven to two; and Oregon, with three to none; and Montana and Nevada, most uncertain. No, no; this will never do; well-meaningly and confidently as in duty bound but with unconscious surety, nevertheless, Mr. Pence is electing a Republican President. Conceding the 220 electoral votes allotted above in his own table, the Republican candidate would need to get only 46 additional from the following 91, to win,

California, 13; New Mexico, 3; Maine, 6; Massachusetts, 18; Michigan, 15; Minnesota, 12; Nevada, 3; Oregon, 5; Wisconsin, 13; Wyoming, 3.—Total, 91.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We cannot abide such figures; they are both illusive and dangerous; and they signify no more nationally than the election of Governors here and there on local, State, and religious issues. The one vital fact is that temporarily the Democratic party has lost pretty nearly everything east of the Alleghanies, has been weakened somewhat in the Middle West, and has rather more than held its own in the Northwest and on the Pacific slope. The causes are sufficiently obvious.

WHY THE EAST REVOLTED

Take the East. Hundreds of thousands of workingmen are out of employment and have been for months; manufacturing is curtailed by lack of demand for products; business is worse than dull; real estate is a drug; enterprise is estopped completely by the closing of the exchanges; reductions in dividends that have not yet been made are anticipated; incomes are shrinking; hateful economies are being enforced in shop, store, and household; nobody perceives a prospect of opportunity to make money; everybody feels poor and nearly everybody is. Mr. Bryan, we regret to observe, detects the age-worn conspiracy of manufacturers to despoil their employees and themselves by "suspending operations or cutting down their forces before the election under conditions which left little doubt that they hoped to arouse opposition to the new tariff law." Drearily we deny the accusation. We do not question Mr. Bryan's belief in what can only be his surmise, but we do wish he would acquaint himself with the facts. Such things may have been done for political purposes years ago, but if ever there has been a time when managements conscious of their responsibility have strained every nerve, against adverse market and financial conditions, to keep the wheels of industry revolving, that time has been the trying year now approaching its unhappy end. We can only hope that Mr. Bryan speaks with accurate foreknowledge when he adds that "now that the election is over the protected manufacturers will resume work."

But it is no less futile than it is disagreeable to touch upon phases of the situation which give rise to impatience. The important task confronting the Administration is to regain the confidence of the great industrial States, for the loss of which it is not wholly responsible, but without which, as we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have indicated clearly above, it cannot hope to succeed itself. It is a common saying that "the war saved Wilson," and to this extent the saying is true, namely, that if, in the last month of the campaign, thousands of patriotic citizens who otherwise would not have voted at all had not responded to the appeal to uphold the President before the world, Congress would have been lost to the Democrats. But it is by no means certain that the general effect of an uncontrollable situation which not only made war taxes necessary, but also intensified the common depression, did not more than offset any political gain from higher motives. The plain fact is that the Administration lost the East because the people of the East had come to suspect, if not quite to believe, that the Administration stood between them and prosperity, that its attitude toward business was unnecessarily and unwisely antagonistic, that it was attempting too much and accomplishing too little of real benefit, and that, while striving for high and commendable things, it was striving without practical judgment and without due consideration of actual conditions.

NEW ENGLAND ESTRANGED

Connecticut affords a striking illustration with its complete turn-over from five Democrats to five Republicans in Congress. Here the presumed effect of tariff reduction played the chief part, no doubt; but if a finishing touch were needed it was furnished, as Governor Simeon Baldwin tartly remarked, by the indiscriminate indictments of New Haven railway directors on the day before election. All New England resented and still resents that proceeding not merely, as Mr. Baldwin intimated, as having been timed for political effect, but as a travesty upon justice itself. This is evidenced beyond question by the press. It is not surprising that a strong partisan journal like the Hartford *Courant* should pronounce the prosecution "a gallery play produced just in time for election effect," and conclude bitterly:

> Some of those indicted never voted for the operations complained of. But they are offenders with the rest. And why? Because they live in New England.

Denunciation so wholly unwarranted as this from such a source merits little consideration, but it is time to take notice when the Springfield *Republican* speaks as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are plainly to be found in the Government's net some who do not deserve to be there, because they were as innocent of the original offending as any of the agents of the Department of Justice. It can scarcely be held in common sense that men who have been called in to help rescue the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad from its difficulties, so as to protect its stockholders, are among those who sought to "monopolize commerce" in violation of the Sherman anti-trust law.

It is difficult to understand how the lines have been drawn in this matter. Among the list of the indicted appears the name of Theodore N. Vail, who did everything that he could, acting from a high sense of public duty, to save the company from its troubles. Then there are Edward Milligan, of Hartford, and Francis T. Maxwell, of Rockville, two men of first-class ability and standing, who went into the board of directors in 1910, after the things the Government complains of had been done. In fact, five members of the present strong board, which has been doing excellent work in rehabilitating the property, are indicted. As if to make the muddle all the more inexplicable to disinterested observers, the man who led in the policy of aggrandizement, of gathering up corporations, is not among those indicted.

It would seem as if Mr. Mellen's name should lead all the rest, but it is not there. The explanation appears to be that by testifying before the grand jury the late president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has secured immunity from prosecution.

Second only to the Springfield *Republican* as a staunch supporter of the Administration is the Boston *Post*, which expresses the same opinion. Still another is the Waterbury *American*, which says:

The feeling of strong criticism expressed by Governor Baldwin on the political side, regarding the gratuitous act of the Attorney-General's office in dragging into the "New Haven's" prosecution the names of the honored citizens of Connecticut long dead, is generally shared on all sides. Calling dead men "conspirators" when the case is so evidently futile and malignant is to damage the Government's chances on the real merits of the question.

Among other especially indignant citizens is Rev. Dr. E. P. Parker, of Hartford, a leading clergyman of Connecticut. He instances as the victims of this desecration men whom he well knew: Luzon Morris, of New Haven, the last Democratic Governor preceding Governor Baldwin; Leverett Brainard; Henry C. Robinson, of Hartford; and Colonel Frank W. Cheney, of Manchester. Whatever their mistakes of judgment, he describes them as men who lived lives of public service, of absolute fidelity and integrity. He thus ends his protest:

"It is this particular part of the indictment programme that seems to me indecent and disgraceful. To rob a grave of the flowers piously strewn upon it or to deface the stone that marks a grave is wanton sacrilege. What then of the useless attempt to assail and dishonor the dead themselves who can no longer reply? I, for one, wish to speak plainly for my dear dead friends, and to protest against what seems to me a heedless if not wanton sacrilege. One would rather go to Hell with some men than to Heaven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with others. I would rather my name should be in that black-list with such names as Morris, Brainard, Robinson, and Cheney than in the official list of their detractors and defamers."

These utterances manifestly indicate a bitterness of feeling which unhappily is more likely to be intensified than modified as time goes on. We are not now assuming to pass upon the merits of the case, but this much at least may be said with confidence: Whether or not injustice has been done in unfair discrimination between individuals designated to bear the ignominy of indictment, and whether or not any real public benefit can be derived from blackening the reputations of dead men shorn of the power of self-defense, the facts should not be ignored that the Department of Justice protested vehemently against the bestowal of immunity upon Mr. Mellen by Mr. Folk, that Attorney-General McReynolds co-operated earnestly in an effort to save the railway property, that Attorney-General Gregory has convinced all concerned of the singleness of his purpose to perform his duties conscientiously, and, finally, that the President himself has had no part whatever in the making of a general crusade whose justification or even excuse has yet to be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it is idle to attempt to blink the fact that New England, whose accord and sympathy with an Administration whose chief attribute is intellectuality of the highest order, is definitely, and it may prove to be permanently, estranged. A pity indeed it is, but true.

NEW YORK AND ILLINOIS

While the party in power suffered from the business depression in New York, the result was due primarily to strife among Democratic factions, to the protest against Tammany recorded in the 116,000 votes cast for the discredited Sulzer, and in no small degree to the activities of Mr. Roosevelt, whose campaign of denunciation materially strengthened Mr. Whitman at the finish. The fact that Mr. Gerard ran 70,000 ahead of the State ticket clearly indicates the special favor in which the Administration is held and might even, with some stretch of the imagination, be construed as leaving a doubt of his defeat if the Senatorship had been the sole issue. In any case, it is nonsensical to herald the result as fixing New York irretrievably in the Republican column two years hence. Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need not be considered. It never yet has failed to uphold the highest of high protection, and probably never will.

Barring Illinois, where also factional strife defeated the Democratic candidate for Senator, the Middle West stood well for the Administration, and the great wheat belt, which has not yet felt the pinch of hard times, registered unmistakable approval. So, too, on the Pacific slope the President received hearty indorsement, notably in California, which elected a Democratic Senator while giving the Democratic candidate for Governor only one-fourth as many votes as were polled by Hiram Johnson.

THE RECESSIVES AND OUR COLONEL

But what of our faithful allies—the dauntless Recessives? Alas, says the *Outlook:* "Generalizations are unsafe, but it may be deduced, perhaps, from the results that, without economic prosperity, the nation has little stomach for political and social reform"—a wise saying and worthy of grave consideration by Democratic leaders. But let Mr. Beveridge speak. "Even if we grow no stronger," he writes, "we hold the balance of power. Neither of the old parties can win without us. And possibly, quite probably, we shall grow stronger. We stand for the great industrial and social movement which"—but never mind about that. "Also," he concludes, "is it not fair to say that we outclass the old parties in bright men?"

In one bright man assuredly, but there we draw the line. The Phœnix of Indiana stands alone. We leave him to struggle manfully in the ashes of his defeat, and turn as ever with delight to the Prophet become Philosopher—Our Colonel. The newspapers report as follows:

> He quoted Scripture to make his point. When he was asked what he thought about the election results he drew forth from his pocket a well-worn leather-bound copy of the New Testament, and with the prefatory remark that he had carried it with him all the way on his expedition through Africa, proceeded to make the following reply:
>
> "In the Episcopal Church lessons taken from the Bible are appointed for every day of the year. The lesson for November 3 includes the second Epistle of Paul to Timothy, Chapter iv., verses 3 and 4, which read as follows:
>
> "'For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears. and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I have nothing to add to this at present. Later, after all the returns are in, I may have something more to say."

From the self-same Lesson, contained in his well-worn leather-bound copy of the New Testament which he carried with him all the way on his expedition through Africa, Our Colonel might have continued to quote these apt and telling passages:

Alexander the coppersmith [Taft?] did me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works.

For Demas [Munsey?] hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.

Only Luke [Perkins?] is with me. Take Mark [Beveridge?] and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry.

For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course.

And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, to whom be glory for ever and ever.

To which, in common with Paul to Timothy, we say with fervor:

Amen!

But alackaday! Our Colonel quotes from the wrong Lesson. And yet we would not chide him; it may be that a leaf was lost from his well-worn, leather-bound copy in the African wilds. Be that as it may, he speaks from the Lesson for November 4th instead of November 3d, which includes the following of peculiar pertinence:

This know also . . . that perilous times shall come.

For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, . . . truce-breakers, false accusers, fierce, . . . despisers of those that are good, . . . heady, high-minded, . . . having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men.

Thus for present purposes endeth that, the true, Lesson for November 3d. That Our Colonel should have mistaken another for it is both understandable and pardonable; better, indeed, could hardly have been expected of a Dutch Reformer who presumes to cite a Protestant Episcopal Lesson from an Africanized Testament.

What Our Philosophical Colonel meant to convey to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minds of the eager populace was what he really did say " in a letter (dated September) to a gentleman in Maryland " [Bonaparte, by chance?] who had promised to support him for the Republican nomination in 1916, to wit:

> I am very sorry to say that I do not think anything whatever can be done through the Republican party as now organized; in any event, as far as I am concerned. The result here in New York has shown that it is utterly useless for me to endeavor to get any Republican of prominence to come out in such a way to make it possible for there to be co-operation between the Republicans and Progressives on any terms which I would consider.
>
> In all big States the Republican party is more reactionary, more completely under the control of the bosses, than it was two years ago. There is literally nothing whatever to be done with it while it continues as it is now; it at present is as far as the poles from the vital principles of Abraham Lincoln Republicanism, and I am sorry to say that actual experience has convinced me that any effort to make a combination between the Progressives and the decent Republicans for good government has resulted only in these decent Republicans being forced into subservience to the machine, and the machine gleefully and screamingly announcing that the Progressives have surrendered to the Republicans, so that the situation becomes worse and not better.
>
> As things are now, it is worse than useless to support the few Republicans who announce that they are for me, but that they intend to remain in the Republican party, for this merely means that if elected they will strengthen the great mass of Republicans, who not only intend to oppose me, which is unimportant, but to oppose all the things for which I stand, which is very important.

Briefly, Our Colonel continues to stand upon the burning deck whence pretty nearly all but him have fled. In the course of his constant search for public policies to square with his personal resentments, he may shift his position occasionally to alleviate the pain of singeing soles, but upon the whole he is as firm for war upon everybody in sight as Mr. Bryan is for peace among contentious men and voting women. And praise be! Our Colonel is happy. On the day after election he " made it plain that however much he may be chagrined by the election of Charles S. Whitman as Governor of New York State, he feels that the nation-wide Republican victory has dealt a tremendous blow at President Wilson's prestige and that he is intensely gratified at that." Compared with the glee which Our Colonel would have radiated at Republican disaster this is as honey extracted from a mother-cask of vinegar. " He did not say so himself, but the secret of his cheerfulness is his belief that the danger of Woodrow Wilson's eclipsing him in personal popularity has passed and that his own chances of election

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Presidency in 1916 have been vastly bettered, whatever happens to the Progressive party." Wonderful, wonderful man! "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

THE PRESIDENT'S NEXT TASK

President Wilson enters upon the second stage of his administrative work under conditions wholly different from those which confronted him upon his inauguration. Committed as he was at the outset to the prompt enactment of remedial legislation, he pursued the course which he had marked out for himself undeviatingly and with a certain scorn of political considerations which could not fail to evoke admiration for his courage, even though at times the expediency of his insistence seemed questionable. The mere keeping of a jaded Congress in session for so unconscionably long a time involved the gravest risk, and the injection of a war-tax measure upon the eve of an election marked the climax of political audacity. A McKinley would never have dreamed of doing such a thing, and even a Roosevelt would have been feazed, if not dismayed, by the possible consequences. The country itself balked at first, but was reconciled finally by realization of the fact that Mr. Wilson simply would not permit partisan advantage to supersede a pressing need. That the Democrats lost many votes in consequence of this persistent urgency must be assumed, but upon the whole the President is warranted in regarding the outcome with complacency.

The Administration passes now into its second and critical period with all important pledges respecting domestic legislation substantially fulfilled and with hands free to grapple the greater problems which have emerged from a world-wide catastrophe. Chief among these, though hardly precedent to the difficult Mexican situation, are the conduct of our foreign affairs and the necessity of achieving resumption of common prosperity. With respect to the former no complaint has come thus far from any source. The most eager critic is unable to put his finger upon a single mistake—a fact which not only augurs well for future conduct, but takes additional strength from confidence already won.

But what will be the condition of the people—our own people—when the great war shall have ended? Upon that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all depends. Compared with it the recent elections are quite barren of significance. If President Wilson shall carry the second part of his programme to a successful conclusion through the resuscitation of business upon a large and sound basis, to the obvious material advantage of the whole people, there will be no changing of horses in crossing the stream two years hence. If he shall fail in that endeavor, even through no fault of his own, the Democratic party will surely go down to disastrous defeat. Excuses will avail nothing. The American people are not consciously unjust or ungenerous, but they know what they want when they need it; and that something just now is better times, which the party in power must provide or make way for another. When pockets are full and life is easy, humans rather enjoy the nagging of one another and cheer on the demagogues, but once the pinch becomes universal they see there is but one boat containing all; and woe to him who rocks it.

That the President understands this may be assumed with surety. Even though his keen vision may have missed such striking symptoms as the killing of the absurd, though presumably popular, "Full Crew Bill" in the Missouri referendum and the storm of noes to the twenty-odd radical proposals in wildest Oregon, the overwhelming repudiation of Our Colonel and all his works cannot have escaped attention, to say nothing of certain Democratic reversals in—shall we say with due diffidence?—New Jersey and other recently enlightened commonwealths.

RAILWAYS AND COMMISSION

But it is not necessary to surmise. Mr. Wilson proved conclusively his breadth of view and his grasp of understanding of the immediate situation when he wrote, in reply to the appeal of railway managers, on September 10th:

> You ask me to call the attention of the country to the imperative need that railway credits be sustained and the railroads helped in every possible way, whether by private co-operative effort or by the action, wherever feasible, of governmental agencies, and I am glad to do so, because I think the need very real.
>
> The interest of the producer, the shipper, the merchant, the investor, the financier, and the whole public in the proper maintenance and complete efficiency of the railways is too manifest. They are indispensable to our whole economic life, and railway securities are at the very heart of most investments, large and small, public and private, by individuals and by institutions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am confident that there will be active and earnest co-operation in this matter, perhaps the one common interest of our industrial life. . . .

But the emergency is, in fact, extraordinary, and where there is a manifest common interest we ought all of us to speak out in its behalf, and I am glad to join with you in calling attention to it. This is a time for all to stand together in united effort to comprehend every interest and to serve and sustain it in every legitimate way.

The present condition could not be epitomized more succinctly or more accurately. There can be no real revival of industry while stock exchanges are closed and owners of bonds and shares cannot market their holdings, and it follows with like certainty that an open market cannot be afforded while hundreds of millions of American railway securities held abroad await only an opportunity for liquidation because of uncertainty respecting interest and dividends. Here is the key-note of the whole situation. An increase in rates by governmental authority which would help to offset the tremendous loss of $120,000,000 of net operating railway revenues in the year ending June 30, 1914, would do more than any other conceivable thing to make possible the general trading which is essential to renewal of confidence and business activities in the United States. It is not, moreover, a mere matter of stocks and bonds; a far more vital thing even than that is credit. Railway companies cannot obtain money for extensions, betterments, or even maintenance when hovering in the shadow of bankruptcy. And this means that manufacturing concerns, iron-makers, steel-makers, tie-makers, and all of the innumerable others who ordinarily supply the railway companies with all sorts of material are estopped completely from performing their normal functions.

Why? Because higher rates are not really needed? No. That fact has been established beyond question. Because the public objects? No. The public long ago was convinced that the higher costs of living and wages reach to the railway companies no less than to all others. Because the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot or will not perceive the "extraordinary emergency" mentioned by the President as making for a "very real need"? Possibly, to a degree; but clearly the chief obstacle in the way of first steps toward prosperity, in the way of open markets, in the way of the United States Government, the Democratic party, and the Democratic President, is Mr. Louis Brandeis, counsel and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guide of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who solemnly insists that the right to "regulate" rates comprises only the right to "reduce" them. The natural assumption is that if that had been the intent of Congress, Congress would have said so, but Mr. Brandeis holds or at least asserts the contrary view—and the amenably autocratic Commission obediently acquiesces.

What to do in such a circumstance? Technically the President is helpless, and Congress, too. Government by Commission invariably involves abandonment of authority by the chosen representatives of the people. The President does right, therefore, even while making his own opinion known, in keeping within the strict letter of the law and refraining from interference. But even a Commission which plumes itself upon being on a plane with the Supreme Court is no greater than the source of its creation; and we say plainly to the patient President that, if this particular body should persist in its present inexcusably dilatory, incomprehensibly stupid, and arrogantly obdurate course, he can do no more popular thing than to ask a willing Congress to legislate it out of existence.

THE FORTHCOMING MESSAGE

More definitely than at any previous time President Wilson is the man of the hour. His party still retains full authority and he continues to be its undisputed leader. The certainty that his recommendations will be heeded lends a very vital significance to the policy which he will outline in his forthcoming Message to Congress, which necessarily becomes at this critical period a far more momentous declaration than was contained in his Inaugural Address. That its tone will evince full realization of existing conditions and breathe the spirit of sober hope is foreshadowed by his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. May we not also anticipate with confidence that it will not lack definiteness? The wish no less than the need of the country is plain: Rigid economy in appropriations; no yielding to the fostered War Spirit which demands great expansion of armaments on sea and land at a time when the rapid exhaustion of other nations renders our position freer from danger than ever before; no river and harbor squandering; no new legislation of any kind except such as may help to reopen the channels of trade and commerce or to facilitate the suc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessful operation of the Banking Act; no financing of one section or one industry at the expense of others in plain contravention of sound public policy; no consideration of proposals which might tend to make necessary an extra session of Congress; no encouragement of sheer radicalism bearing the specious label of progression; no attention whatever to the partisan harangues of political opponents who can discredit only themselves by seeking advantage from distressing conditions forced upon us by foreign peoples.

This is the straight and true course. Plain announcement of it and firm adherence to it are the sole requisites of common advancement—advancement, in the President's own inspiring words, "with a new spirit, a new enthusiasm, a new cordiality of co-operation," to the end that the whole country may, indeed, and at no distant day, "look back upon the past as upon a bad dream."

OUR PRAYER FOR PEACE

But without faith, it is impossible to please Him, for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.—Hebrews xi: 6.

PRAYER suggests a Power not our own which we may invoke. It is not magic. It has its own principles, its own ordered world. Its root principle is faith. And faith is receptivity. Prayer challenges us to put ourselves in a receptive attitude to Unseen Agents, to Invisible Helpers. We believe there is help beyond man's counsel. We believe that there are hints, suggestions, assistances all about us in an Invisible realm, if we will but listen. We are a Nation in prayer, waiting for a hint from the Unseen of how, under God, we may achieve peace and good-will in a world at war.

Now, if we are to secure this help; if we are to get this divine hint; we must be clear as to what we really want. If prayer is not magic, neither is it confusion. It is not a wild, anarchic thing, crying for aid to a God of caprice. Nor is it a helpless wail. There is a time and place for the prayer that is the "infant crying in the night"; but this is not the time for that kind of prayer.

Part of the prayerful effort of America is to crystallize the moral and spiritual public opinion of the civilized world;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to seek God's help in doing this, and to bring to our aid His assistance in making it effectual. We have a right to do this as a thing in which God is interested. Already the request we have to make, and the kind of assistance we require, is becoming clear. The intelligent soul of this neutral people wants no temporary truce. The consensus of religious feeling and opinion is that nothing will satisfy us but a lasting Peace. We pray that at last that principle of action among nations which came into being with the Hague Tribunal may now be made effective in a parliament of the world. In keeping with this spirit is a resolution passed by The Baptist Missionary Society, wherein it was Resolved "that this Society shall seek to promote and permanently conserve the welfare of all nations now engaged in war and of the world at large, and shall involve a federation of nations with an international court, and international army and navy, with disarmament of the several nations of the federation and cessation of the manufacture of implements of war, except by the national government under control of the international federation." Believing that such aspiration is in line with the eternal Purpose of Spirit, we seek divine help to bring it about.

Our prayer as a people, then, must be one of *humble restraint.* The thing we are praying for is so tremendous that we must indeed "wait on God." We must not mistake our own fancies and hot desires for the divine voice. If we are waiting for God to speak, we must be in readiness to hear. And we cannot hear if we are engaged in inconsequential chatter. There is much sentimentality and hysteria in the land. Hypocritical and sensational demands for peace and intervention are being made in press and public gatherings by folk who seize upon a world disaster to secure a passing notoriety or, worse still, selfish gain. There are also many well-intentioned emotional folk who need the rebuke the mariner gave in Shakespeare's "Tempest"—"You Assist the Storm"—or that modern version—"Sit Down; You're Rocking the Boat." Divine interventions and solutions of human problems have often been made abortive by man's untimely action. Too soon is as bad as too late; and a hurried early intervention, even if possible, might but perpetuate and extend the mistake of false rivalry and international fear witnessed in burdensome armaments, now being wiped out in blood. Into this seething whirl of false ambition and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national pride America might herself be drawn; thus inviting a still more dreadful future Armageddon, and postponing for centuries Christ's thousand years of peace. We pray, therefore, to-day for restraint that as a nation we may know God's hour; and, taking it at its flood, may be led by Him to lead the world into the ways of an enduring and worthy world peace.

And surely part of our prayer for restraint is, that as a people God will keep our hands clean in the use we make of the war. These are our brothers. If we are to be used of God at the right moment to intervene for Peace, we must see to it that there is no just suspicion of a neutrality maintained from sordid motives. We are called upon in a measure to care for the commerce of the world. And we must strive to enter into the opportunity justly thus afforded. We must as a wise people correct those evils in navigation and commerce that have hindered our own development. The war "stabbed us broad awake" to many domestic wrongs, and antiquated customs outworn and inadequate. With clear vision we must correct these and set our commercial house to rights while the light is given. But we must not as a nation say, "It's an ill wind that blows nobody good," and strive in unfraternal ways to profit by our brothers' misfortune. And let us put down with wrath the evil spirits worse than starving ghouls in the battle's wake who use the war as pretext to make it harder for the many to live.

We must prove to the nations that ours is not a sinister neutrality. Let us pray, rather, that in this hour the soul of America may at last be revealed. Then the peoples of the earth will understand that ours is the warfare of peace, the warfare for freedom, for the rights of men, for generous rivalry in expanding opportunity. They will see that it is our dedication to the principle of human rights that makes us disinterested. As a nation we believe in the right to live and grow according to an inner and divine destiny of all sorts of races and peoples. We do not desire to Americanize the world. We believe in variety in unity; in diversity of life within one spirit of freedom and love. This principle accounts for our open-door policy in China, for our restoration of Cuba to the people of the Island, for our promise to the Philippines, for our method of dealing with Mexico. To fight for one's own rights is to be strong. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight for the rights of others is to be invincible. Let us ask God, then, to keep us as a people on this high level of disinterested faith in the right of every people to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," to the end that when the hour shall strike the nations will trust us; for they will know, as our President has said, that "America puts human rights above all others, and her flag is not only the flag of America, but the flag of humanity."

WORLD POWER, OR POWERS?

THE fundamental question to be answered by the result of the present European war is whether the grandiose phrase "world Power" is henceforth to be singular or plural. Is there to be a world Power, or are there to be world Powers? Is some one country to dominate the globe, as Rome did at the beginning of our era? Or shall there be a number of nations of world-encompassing interests and influence, existing in amicable co-ordination?

The question is not new. It is practically as old as history. Its existence in semi-mythical times is suggested by the opening lines of Firdusi's *Shah Nameh:* "Kaiumers first sat upon the throne of Persia, and was master of the world." Of that proud assumption of the early rulers of Iran we have a reminder to-day in the half-pathetic title of the impotent sovereign of decadent Persia, "Shah-in-Shah" or King of Kings. Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, and Alexander of Macedon successively aspired to universal dominion, each advancing nearer to the goal, perhaps, than the predecessor. Rome and Carthage were rivals for it, and after the final and complete overthrow of the latter the former attained it probably more fully than any other nation has ever done, before or since.

In the decline of Rome the nations were thrown into the melting-pot, and presently the old question began again to take form. Charlemagne for a time gave promise of solving it, but failed and left the world more devoid than ever, not only of a single supreme Power, but also of important Powers not seeking universal conquest. Then, while the numerous petty European states were wrangling and fighting among themselves, the Mohammedans and also the Tartars strove for world-wide primacy. Both failed, but their stupendous struggles had the salutary effect of awakening Europe to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessity of pursuing a new policy which should both permit and encourage the development of great Powers. At last the fall of Constantinople gave the final impetus, and Christian Europe eagerly leaped forward into an era of expansion and of the organization of world-embracing empires.

Through fortuitous circumstance, Spain was enabled to take the lead. It was by the merest chance, decided by the turning of a hair, that the American continents were discovered under Spanish instead of British patronage. The result was to exalt the Iberian kingdom, which had recently been struggling for local existence, into something more like a *Weltreich* than the world had seen since the days of Rome. King of Spain, Emperor of Germany, and sovereign at least in claim of the whole Western Hemisphere, Charles V. came nearer to being a veritable King of Kings than any one in a dozen centuries. Only the stubborn Netherlands and British Isles barred his way to universal power.

The speedy sequel was the development of three great Powers, each of which aimed at world-wide supremacy, and war after war was waged among them for the attainment of that end, in Europe and in America. Out of two centuries of such strife the smallest of the three emerged the greatest; and at the end of the Seven Years' War, if Great Britain was not the one supreme world Power, she was at least much nearer to that estate than was any other, and she had effectively destroyed the hopes of France and Spain.

In the course of that very war, however, another vigorous and ambitious aspirant to world-dominance was revealed; and it is one of the colossal ironies of fate that this new Power came into puissant being largely through the good offices of the very Power with which now, over this very same question of world-dominance, it is engaged in most bitter and unrelenting strife. If it had not been for British aid, Frederick the Great might not have made Prussia a great Power; and if he had not done that, there might have been no German Empire in our day.

France under Bonaparte was the next aspirant, and for a time it seemed not unlikely to attain its end. Only a single nation stood in the way. If Bonaparte could have crushed Great Britain at the end of the eighteenth century, he might have had all the civilized world at his feet. For he could then have taken possession of Louisiana and Canada, as he designed to do, and the United States would thus have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

circumscribed with hostile limits which would have made it impossible for it to rise above the second rank of nations. But the breaking of the Peace of Amiens sealed the doom of Bonaparte's dream of universal rule.

In the century since Waterloo, three further essays in the same direction have been made. One was fantastically futile from its very inception—that of Louis Napoleon. It never became sufficiently advanced to merit serious attention. The second was that of Russia, continued through many years; which may have been designed less to attain world-wide dominion than merely to secure an adequate outlet for that empire upon the open high seas of the globe. Whatever its real purpose, however, it was vigorously and effectively resisted by one of—and in one notable instance by both of—the very nations which are now allied with Russia in withstanding the third and last of these attempts at exclusive *Weltreich.*

This last attempt is being made by Germany, under Prussian hegemony, as the culmination of a train of antecedent circumstances not surpassed in history for international interest. Nominally and logically Germany, as the continuation of the "Holy Roman Empire," was centuries ago entitled to be the premier Power of Christendom. It was prevented from being that, and was relegated to a comparatively minor station for several centuries by its own lack of unity and indeed the dissensions and antagonisms which prevailed among the fragments into which it was divided. This condition was aggravated by the shrewd diplomacy of other Powers, particularly France, which was steadily directed toward keeping the German states divided. That policy of France, initiated by the Valois if not the Capetian kings, was continued by the Bourbons, by Bonaparte, by the Restored Bourbons, and by Louis Napoleon; justifying the declaration of Bismarck in 1870 that he was fighting Louis XIV.

It was the Great Elector, the founder of the Prussian state, who first practically realized this fatal weakness of Germany, and set himself to the correction of it; and it was his great-grandson, Frederick the Great, who made that correction effective. The *leit motif* of Frederick's policy was the unification of Germany, the means adopted to that end being the aggrandizement of Prussia through the conquest and absorption of neighboring states and provinces. Held perforce in abeyance during the Napoleonic period, that policy was re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

newed with consummate skill and vigor by Bismarck, in the Danish war, the Austrian war, and finally in the war with France in 1870; of which, at its very beginning, King William significantly declared: "Love of the common Fatherland and the unanimous uprising of all the German races have conciliated all opinions and dissipated all disagreements. . . . From this bloody seed will arise . . . the unity of Germany."

The unity of Germany having indeed thus been achieved, attention was directed toward colonial expansion, in practically every quarter of the globe. A large part of Africa was seized. Many Pacific islands were annexed; including the chief members of the Samoan group, of Germany's dealings with which America has a keen and not agreeable recollection. Japan was despoiled of the fruits of her victory over China, and then a considerable foothold in China was seized by Germany. Large colonies were developed in South America, and there arose suspicions that plans were being made for the acquisition of either the Dutch or the Danish West Indies. Vast concessions were secured in Asia Minor. Never, probably, did any nation extend its possessions more rapidly and its influence more widely. Most marked of all, perhaps, was what we may call diplomatic expansion. The proposition was broached that Germany was legitimately concerned in almost everything that went on among all nations of the world, and must therefore be consulted concerning them. Following her intervention between China and Japan she sought, though vainly and with the British Ambassador as an unwitting catspaw, to intervene between the United States and Spain in 1898. The marplot activities of Germans, if not of Germany, in Colombia were responsible for most of the delay in canal diplomacy and of the unpleasantness between this country and its South-American neighbor. Her gratuitous intrusion into the Morocco affair threatened at one time to embroil Europe in war. There was demanded for Germany "a place in the sun" diplomatically, commercially, and colonially.

At the beginning of this war, then, what we may call the Prussianized German Empire was one of the greatest and was by far the most aggressive of the world Powers. In colonies and commerce she was second, as also in naval strength, while in armed strength on land she was easily first. This growth had, moreover, been legitimate: or if any of it had been effected by questionable means it would be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult to point to a nation of comparable rank so free from such faults as to be entitled to cast the first reproachful or chastening stone. Yet there had also grown up a strong distrust of and antagonism toward Germany, on the part of several other Powers, notably France and Great Britain, such as were felt toward no other nation. These feelings are declared by Germany to have had their origin in nothing but jealousy of that Empire's superior growth and prosperity. But those who entertained them attributed them to the fact that Germany alone accompanied her civil and industrial expansion with enormous and unprecedented preparations for military conquest. Mirabeau once said that war was the national industry of Prussia, and the same characterization was applied in recent years to that German Empire of which Prussia was the head and heart.

Between the two views of the case we need not here attempt to judge. Neither need we concern ourselves with the much-disputed question of responsibility for the actual precipitation of the war. The salient fact is that most of the great Powers took the view which we have attributed to them, and that the Allies are now acting upon it. There is and there has been no such feeling toward any other Power. Great Britain and France, for example, have developed their great colonial holdings in Asia, Africa, and the Pacific, without any thought that an armed clash over them would ever have to occur. Neither of them has suspected the other of aiming to become the sole world Power. Perhaps the feeling toward Germany is quite unwarranted. But it has existed, and it exists to-day; and belief in its accuracy is so strong as to form the dominant motive in the war. Indeed, it is so strong that it will doubtless be regarded as a reality by whichever side may win. If Germany wins, she will take the Allies at their word, and reduce them to a less than world Power rank, leaving herself the only world Power of Europe. If the Allies win, they will doubtless administer a similar reduction to Germany; leaving themselves, however, all three world Powers. Which of these two results shall be achieved is perhaps the most important question to be determined by this war.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND THE WAR

It had to come, of course. No international controversy is complete without the Monroe Doctrine. That venerable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instrument has been invoked in Behring Sea sealing contests and in wrangles over canal tolls at Panama. It was brought forward when we annexed the Philippines, and was solemnly reviewed to ascertain its bearings upon our participation in the Morocco settlement. That a great European war could be waged without appeal to it was too much to be expected. And indeed this latest citation of the Doctrine is not altogether void of pertinence or profit, though much will doubtless be said which will cause the judicious to grieve. It presents for consideration a phase of the Doctrine, or rather of the foreign policy of this nation, which has not been as well determined, at least in the popular mind, as it deserves and needs to be.

The proposition is made that since Canada has sent troops to Europe to aid Great Britain in fighting Germany, Germany has a right to retaliate by sending a military expedition to attack Canada, to invade it, and to conquer it as any other belligerent might be conquered. This, it is argued, would be no violation of the Monroe Doctrine, since Canada forfeited its protection thereunder—if it ever enjoyed it—when it participated in the European war.

From one point of view that seems quite logical. We could not well maintain that Canada or any other country was free to attack others, but was itself exempt from attack in return. A nation which engages in war must give and take whatever fortunes the war may bring. We accept that principle for ourselves, and we could not withhold our protégés—if our neighbors were our protégés—from its application. Carried to its fullest extent, then, that would mean that Germany, if it were able to do so, might overrun Canada as it has overrun Belgium, and, if victorious in the war, might annex Canada and Newfoundland, Belize, and British Guiana, the Bahamas, the Bermudas, and the British West Indies, and also French Guiana and the French Indies, as spoils of war; as we ourselves took Porto Rico and the Philippines from Spain.

This view seems to be further supported by the record of our dealings with various American States in their controversies and conflicts with European Powers. Thus we permitted Great Britain to blockade the Plate River; and Great Britain, France, and Spain to wage war against Mexico; and Spain to fight Chili and Peru; and Great Britain to attack Nicaragua and occupy Corinto. In these cases the European Powers were the military aggressors, and their conduct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was thus potentially more menacing and offensive to the United States than that of Germany would be in simply retaliating upon Canada for the latter's aggression.

Still more, it is urged that we should not be as solicitous concerning Canada as concerning these others. It is obvious that for the purposes of the Monroe Doctrine the countries of the Western Hemisphere are divided into two distinct categories, namely, the independent American republics and the colonial possessions of European Powers. The Monroe Doctrine itself in its text very explicitly recognizes this distinction, and indicates a radical difference in the attitude and policy of the United States toward the two classes. "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." It was with reference to these latter States that the Doctrine was framed and enunciated. With the former it had nothing to do. Obviously, then, our present concern is greater for the independent States than for the European dependencies. If we have permitted European Powers to wage wars against the American republics, we cannot forbid them to do so against the colonies or dominions of other belligerent European Powers.

So far from that point of view. But there are some other and very different considerations when we look a little below the surface and further into the case. It is to be observed, in the first place, that in the various conflicts between American States and European Powers the United States was never a disinterested spectator. On the contrary, it has always prescribed a limit of operations and has been prepared to enforce it. It has not objected to the exaction, even by military means, of redress for wrongs and of the fulfilment of obligations. But it has required that such operations should not be pushed beyond the attainment of such ends; and particularly that they should not be carried to the point of that oppression or control of destiny which the Monroe Doctrine forbids. For example, it did not prevent the exer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of military pressure upon Mexico by Great Britain, France, and Spain for the fulfilment of international obligations; but when France strove in addition to subvert the native Mexican government and to control the destiny of the country through the establishment of a European monarchy, it objected and intervened in a very effective manner.

A similar course might be pursued in respect to Canada or any other European dominion on these continents. The United States might not seek estoppel of ordinary measures of warfare. It certainly would oppose, in whatever way might be necessary, any attempt at permanent occupation, annexation, or political control. Indeed, it would probably object to even a temporary invasion and occupation, reasonably holding that maritime and coastal operations, particularly blockade, should be sufficient for securing the satisfaction to which the attacking power might be entitled.

That would, it is true, be to treat the European dependencies very much as we treat the independent republics. Whether under the letter of the Doctrine we have the right to do so may be a moot point, though it is probably to be decided in the affirmative. There is a difference between ourselves interfering with those dependencies, which we have engaged not to do, and forbidding others to interfere with them. But there is another ground, both older and stronger, on which the United States could consistently and doubtless would object to anything resembling a conquest of any European dependency in America by any other European Power, in any manner or in any circumstances. That is, the principle which has come to be called the Polk Doctrine, because of its application by President Polk to the case of Yucatan in 1848, when the authorities of that country offered to transfer its dominion and sovereignty to Great Britain or to Spain. "We could not consent," said Polk, "to a transfer of this 'dominion and sovereignty' to either Spain, Great Britain, or any other European Power."

In that President Polk was quite right, but he was not original, and it is not clear that the doctrine thus enunciated should be called by his name. He himself did not claim authorship of it, but spoke of it as "our established policy" and attributed it specifically to the Monroe Doctrine, or at least to Monroe's message, which declares that we should consider any attempt on the part of European countries to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangerous to our peace and safety. That attribution may not be altogether judicious, since it might be questioned whether the mere transfer of sovereignty from one Power to another was an "extension" of a system. But there are other reasons, based on older and more specific authorities than Monroe's message, for regarding Polk's doctrine as even then "our established policy."

The earliest specific enunciation of that policy was perhaps made by Rufus King, our Minister to England in 1801; when he told Lord Hawkesbury that "we are contented that the Floridas remain in the hands of Spain, but should not be willing to see them transferred, except to ourselves." Less than two years later King also said to Mr. Addington that the United States had no objection to Spain's continuing to possess New Orleans, but that for England or France to possess it would be contrary to our views and would be a matter of serious concern. We are all familiar with Jefferson's strenuous objection, in 1802–03, to the transfer of Louisiana to France and his purpose to go to war, if necessary, to prevent it. Again, in 1808, Jefferson declared: "We shall be well satisfied to see Mexico and Cuba remain in their present dependence; but very unwilling to see them in that of either France or England." At the beginning of 1811 Congress, by resolution, declared concerning Florida that the United States could not "without serious inquietude see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign Power," other, of course, than Spain, which then possessed it; and it authorized the President to take military possession of Florida if necessary to prevent such a transfer. In 1823 John Quincy Adams, foreshadowing the Monroe Doctrine, of which he was the chief author, declared that "the transfer of Cuba to Great Britain would be an event unpropitious to the interests of this Union. The question both of our right and of our power to prevent it, if necessary by force, already obtrudes itself upon our councils, and the Administration is called upon, in the performance of its duties to the nation, at least to use all the means within its competency to guard against and forefend it."

All those utterances and actions, and some others to similar effect, were antecedent to the Monroe Doctrine: They were followed by others of the same kind; even more forceful. Clay, when Secretary of State in John Quincy Adams's Cabinet, declared that the United States was willing to have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cuba remain in the possession of Spain, but "could not with indifference see it passing from Spain to any other European Power"; indeed, that "we could not consent to the occupation of those islands [Cuba and Porto Rico] by any other European Power than Spain, under any contingency whatever." Polk was thus well within bounds when he referred to his policy toward Yucatan as "our established policy."

In these various enunciations, substitute "Canada" for Cuba, Florida, Mexico, or Yucatan, and the logical policy of the United States at the present time stands revealed, unmistakable and impregnable. Note that the references are to "transfer," to "passing into the hands," to "occupation," and to "any contingency whatever." That is to say—and the historical record of the circumstances confirms the interpretation—the United States was unwilling that a European dependency in America should be transferred to the possession of any other European Power in any way; in peace or in war, by sale and purchase or by martial conquest. It is not to be conceded, it is not conceivable, that we have now departed, or that we intend in any degree or respect to depart, from that salutary and indeed essential principle. Jefferson, Adams, and Clay down to date substantially declare:

"We could not consent to the occupation of Canada by any other European Power than Great Britain under any contingency whatever."

There is probably not one chance in a million that any serious attempt will be made at such occupation or transfer, in the case of Canada or any other British dependency. It is conceivable that it may some time be made in the case of the American possessions of some other Power; either Holland or Denmark. In any event, it is well that at this time the historic policy of this nation shall be reviewed, and that our own people, our interested neighbors, and the whole world, shall be reminded of what that policy has been, is, and will be—"yesterday, to-day, and forever."

One other point: It might be that some dependency, or its proprietary Power, would not wish us to exercise such a policy toward it; that, indeed, it might actually desire to have such a change of dominion and sovereignty effected. In that case, should the United States insist upon its policy, against the will of the parties concerned? The answer is found in historical precedents, and in the letter and spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. On more than one occasion there was an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unmistakable desire on the part of one Power to transfer its possessions to another, for a *quid pro quo,* and the bargain would have been consummated but for the known opposition of the United States. Again, it must be borne in mind that, contrary to a too common misapprehension, the Monroe Doctrine is not an altruistic, but a selfish enunciation. It was put forward not for the protection of our neighbors *per se,* but for the conservation of our own peace, security, and welfare. Monroe's message was filled with that idea. "*To the defense of our own* this whole nation is devoted. . . . We should consider any attempt to extend their system as dangerous *to our peace and safety.* . . . We could not view any interposition . . . in any other light than as the manifestation of an *unfriendly spirit toward the United States.*"

That confirms this policy for to-day. We objected to the transfer of Florida, Cuba, Yucatan, *et al.,* because it would have been unpropitious for the United States. So we should object to either a military conquest or an amicable cession of Canada or of Curaçao, of St. Thomas or of Cayenne, not because the country concerned did not want to be transferred, or because its European suzerain did not want to transfer it, but because such transfer would not comport with the best interests of the United States. That is the advanced and masterful interpretation and application of the Monroe Doctrine, or rather of the foreign policy of the United States as it has prevailed for much more than a hundred years. It may not be unprofitable that consideration of this policy has been provoked at the present time.

COMMENT

Nobody knew until after election that Sir George Perkins crept out stealthily after dark and ran surreptitiously for membership of the Constitutional Convention from the Twenty-second district on the *Republican* ticket—a truly shocking, but highly Progressive, performance. He was beaten, to be sure, by a Tammany leader, but even so, says the *Brooklyn Eagle,* sternly, "he should be stripped of his epaulettes as a Bull Moose commander for deserting in the face of the enemy." Sir George, however, made his position quite clear on the morning after when, replying to an interviewer regarding the result, he said, plainly:

When you buy bluefish get a large one. It costs about five cents a pound less than a medium-sized one, and if you buy a large one you will have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough left over for another meal. Any fish left over can be used to make fish cakes or it can be creamed and put in a dish and baked.

An incontestable proposition, as Mr. Henry James is accustomed to remark.

Dolefully, the New York *Times* remarks:

There seems to be only one man in official life at Washington who is aware that the election approves and sustains his opinion that there is a new temper in affairs. All the others are laying plans anew for the old games which have failed to carry the country's approval. There is to be another River and Harbor bill, and another Ship Purchase bill, or perhaps a Ship Loan bill. There is to be a Public Buildings bill and a $25,000,000 Good Roads bill. Representative Lewis and Postmaster-General Burleson, of course, will revive their Government ownership of telegraphs and telephones.

But what boots it if there is but one man who comprehends a situation if that one happens to be the one in control?

George Harvey has scored as a prophet by missing every guess he made.—*Wheeling Intelligencer.*

Say not so! We surmised that the Democrats would carry the House by fifty or more, and their plurality is forty; we guessed, further, "that our Colonel's former ally, Sulzer, 'the crook,' will poll more votes than Mr. Davenport; that Senators Smoot, Penrose, Gallinger, and Dillingham will be re-elected; that Mr. Cannon and Mr. Longworth will regain their seats; and that Governor Walsh will beat Mr. McCall" —all of which came to pass. We misjudged New York and Illinois, more's the pity.

Measured by serenity and cheerful Amerian optimism, a most excellent guess.—*The World.*

Ah, but if the *World* had supported the ticket!

Speaking of the habit of General Kearny's soldiers of affectionately calling him "Phil," the President said he had always been sorry he did not have a "front name which admitted of shortening."—*New York Times.*

From which we infer that the President has definitely yielded to the Vice-President the use of Thomas as an original possession.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even Senator La Follette finds occasion for gratification, saying:

Incidentally, the country rejoices that Wilson is President, not Roosevelt, whose recently expressed attitude toward disarmament confirms this judgment. The accumulating and increasing horrors of the European wars are creating a great tidal wave of public opinion that sweeps aside all specious reasoning and admits of but one simple common-sense, humane conclusion—a demand for peace and disarmament among civilized nations.

True enough; incidentally, too, the country rejoices that Wisconsin finally broke away from La Folletteism and elected a Democratic Senator.

President Wilson motored directly from the station to Piping Rock, where he played a round of golf in eighty strokes, which was considered very good, as he was playing with an entirely new set of clubs.—*The Times.*

Not bad, indeed! Assistant-President House, who kept the score, should have been engaged to " approximate " the election returns.

A gift that would be a welcome remembrance for the woman who takes her breakfast in bed is a well-designed tray.—*The Evening Post.*

" Breakfast in bed,"—the parasite! Put a frying-pan in her stocking.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANY AND THE POWERS

BY DR. BERNHARD DERNBURG

When, like a stroke of lightning from a serene blue heaven, the world war broke out in Europe, Americans stood dumfounded, amazed, and horrified. All the attainments of twentieth-century civilization seemed to crumble under their very feet. All the endeavors that had been made to settle international difficulties by treaties or arbitration seemed to be absolutely futile. All the protestations that the various peoples of Europe had been making continuously for peace and good-will were discredited. It was not so much the resentment against the disturbance of trade, the stopping of exports, and inconvenience of unbalanced financial relations, the anxiety for a host of relatives and friends who had been entrapped in the warring countries, that roused this American feeling; the public on this side was deeply hurt in its ethical feeling, in its moral attitude, toward solemn obligations, in its sympathies for smaller nations. What was all that civilization that the world had been boasting of so much? What did the word "culture" mean if from one day to the next Europe could become the field of brutality, burning, and sacking? Was not the world thrown back for a century or more, and were not all the sincere endeavors to bring about a more human state of things by international treaties permanently in danger by this spectacle of treaties being disregarded and torn to shreds? What would all this mean for the United States? Had she not let herself be inveigled into a spirit of security, into an optimism without foundation, into the hope for a better and more peaceful world?

The breaking out of the war was considered here as a crime against humanity, and it cannot be wondered at that the next question was, Who was the author of that crime? Who permitted it, by act or tolerance, to be perpetrated? The answer seemed to come quickly on irrefutable evidence. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brutality of the Austrian ultimatum; the failure of Germany to repress her ally; the Russian feeling for the small boundary states; the French resentment of the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine; the English attitude toward guaranteed treaties—all seemed to be a chain of evidence that laid the blame to the door of Germany, and Germany did not defend herself because she could not—being deprived of direct communication in consequence of the cutting of cables and the stringent British rules against the printing of uncensored news.

So the judgment was quickly formed. It could only be formed on the evidence presented, one-sided though it was. And, in the absence of facts, Americans had to rely on sentiment which strongly favored the Allies.

The greater the American nation has become the more it has built up a civilization of its own. The more intense national life has grown, the less Americans have had reason to busy themselves with the happenings in far-away countries, and as little as it can be expected that the men in the interior of Russia should know anything of American institutions and statecraft, as little can it be fairly demanded that Americans should be intimately acquainted with the intricacies of European politics.

Therefore it may not be amiss to try to sketch the state of things in Europe as it has been, the various peoples involved, their aims, ambitions, and necessities, the driving forces behind them, and the historical development that resulted in the explosion.

The immediate cause was the trouble between Austria and Servia. Servia has played the foremost part in the Balkans, as Professor Sloane in his remarkable book, *The Balkans, a Historical Laboratory,* has pictured. A strong and valorous people, dominated mostly by its clans, practically without industry, a peasant nation, continuously engaged for centuries in fights for national existence and in internal strifes for the supremacy of the great chieftains. Expansive, as all the Slav peoples, Servia has sought for many years to enlarge her territory. There were two possibilities: either at the expense of Turkey or at the expense of Austria-Hungary, in whose confines several millions of Serbs are living. "All Slavs are brethren"—that is the doctrine. All Slavs must be under Slavish rulers, and all territory inhabited by Serbs is part of an unalienable inheritance of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Servian kingdom. So, a "Greater Servia" has been the aim of a people who had not many cultural goods to defend, no great wealth to effeminate them, frugal and warlike as they were. In order not to go back too deep into history, I would refer my readers to the Balkan Alliance, consisting of two treaties, the one between Servia and Bulgaria of February 29, 1912, and the second between Greece and Bulgaria of May 16, 1912. These treaties contain secret clauses that were published in 1913 in *Le Matin* of Paris. These secret clauses provide for a division of the Balkans between Servia and Bulgaria on a north-southerly line, leaving the western part to Servia, the eastern part to Bulgaria. The open part of the treaty provides for a purely defensive alliance; the secret part shows the aims and the element that has been dominant in the bringing about of that alliance, directed, as to Servia, against Austria, and as to Bulgaria, against Turkey. This dominant factor is Russia. Article First of the secret clauses says:

> That if Servia and Bulgaria convene to act, it is to be communicated to Russia, and if Russia does not oppose itself, the action will proceed. If they cannot agree as to an action, they will apply to Russia, whose decision will be obligatory upon both parties. Should Russia not give any opinion at all and the two parties cannot concert, that party that will undertake an action must proceed alone, the other keeping in friendly neutrality supported by partial mobilization.

Article Three says:

> A copy of this treaty and of its secret clauses will be jointly communicated to the Russian Government, which will be asked to take note of it, and to give proof of its good-will regarding the ends sought, and the Emperor of Russia will be asked to kindly accept and approve for his person and his Government the rôle assigned to them in the treaty. All differences that should result from the interpretation or execution of the treaty are to be submitted to the definite decision of Russia.

And Article Fifth says:

> This appendix is not to be published without the consent of Russia.

Thus it will be seen Russia was able to pull the strings, and she did. When Italy seized upon Tripoli, and the Turkish fleet was engaged with the Italian navy that took possession of a number of islands in the Ægean, the war was started against Turkey, and it looked for a moment as if she were to be driven out of Europe altogether. But Bulgaria aspired for more of the conquered territory than Rus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sia was willing to concede, for reasons we shall see hereafter, and a new war broke out between Servia and Greece on the one side, and Bulgaria on the other. Bulgaria was brought very near to destruction; then the Czar of Bulgaria addressed himself for help to Austria. It was at this juncture that Russia saw fit to publish the secret clause of the treaty showing that Bulgaria had conspired with her and with Servia to fight Austria. Peace was finally concluded in Bucharest—a peace that was not to the satisfaction of Austria. She tried to engage Germany in her attempt to annul the Bucharest protocol—which Germany refused to do, although thereby greatly grieving her ally, in the interests of the peaceful people of the world. So Servia attained her end in about doubling her size; but the spirit of conquest cannot be repressed once it has started and has been successful. The Servian aim had been to gain free access to a harbor on the Adriatic. Austria had opposed herself, the Greater Servian dream remained still unfulfilled, and Servia now directed her attention to the Austrian provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, because the Austrian interests in the western part of the Balkans barred Servia's way to the sea. Then those conspiracies set in, sowing discord among Austrian peoples, inveigling into mutiny Austrian subjects, swamping Bosnia and the south of Hungary with Servian literature; it ended in the murder of the Crown Prince of Austria and his wife on June 28th, and nobody who knew anything at all of the doings in the Balkans could have the slightest doubt that Servia only tackled her big neighbor because of the promise of Russia to stand by her, as was evidenced by the treaty above cited. The aims of Servia are commensurate with the nature of her people, with the state of her culture, with the ambitions of her statesmen.

But why did Russia countenance all that? Among all the Slav peoples Russia has been the most restive for ages. She has added to her dominions constantly and is now the empire of the greatest territorial extension. She is autocratic, and she must keep the minds of her people busy. It is from her soil that all the hordes have ever penetrated into Europe, from the times of Ghengis-Khan and Timur-i-leng—Mongols, Tartars, and Poles. She has spread out east and south, her efforts always alternating in the two directions. An enormous empire that is turning now its efforts toward the building up of an indus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try. Having been defeated in the East in 1904, unable to retrieve her defeat by Japan in consequence of the British alliance with Japan, and being handicapped in the efforts to reach the Indian Ocean by the British-Russian compact of 1907, she again turned her eyes to the south. World commerce and world power are no longer confined to continents. Any considerable export trade demands access to the sea, a mercantile marine, and a certain liberty of movement. Look how she is situated in that respect! This enormous empire, the largest on earth, has not even one outlet to the sea accessible at all times of the year. Her northern harbor, Archangel, is icebound as early as September. It is connected with its industrial center only by one single-track line of more than a thousand miles. The harbor of Kronstadt is equally ice-bound in the winter, and it is, moreover, only a harbor to the Baltic, that is dominated by Germany. A third harbor, Vladivostok, on the far Japan Sea, is of no account, freezing up also very early in the year. Her attempt to get into the Chinese Sea by way of Port Arthur has been finally frustrated, by Japan forcing Russia to retire from it in 1904, when equally she lost her chance of reaching out by way of Korea. But all the strong Northern peoples have always had their eyes on more clement climates, and there has been from time immemorial a constant pressing of Gauls and Teutons, of Slavs and Mohammedan Indians, toward the ocean to the south. But here again Russia finds herself absolutely barred. All attempts to get free access to the Mediterranean have invariably come to naught. The Powers interested in the Mediterranean did not want another strong Power to compete with them there, or to menace their domination. So Russia in her attempts to break the Turkish rule in the Dardanelles has always been opposed by the rest of Europe. The Crimean War was waged in 1854 against Russia by the combined forces of Turkey, France, and England, and ended in the Paris protocol, re-establishing the control of Turkey over the Bosporus, and forbidding any men-of-war to pass by Constantinople. When, by the help of Rumania, Russia was victorious in 1878 and forced upon Turkey the treaty of San Stefano, dictating its terms under the very doors of Constantinople, Europe interceded, and Russia was thrown back by the Congress of Berlin, and her efforts were again frustrated. But in 1908 she addressed herself to Austria for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a revision of the Paris treaty of 1856. Austria, while amenable to Russian demands, made her assent contingent upon French and English consent, and these two Powers did not see their way to satisfy her.

So the national tendency of Russia to get to Constantinople, and the Servian ambitions to get an outlet to the Adriatic, strengthened the natural political tie between the countries. Now it is easily understood why Bulgaria was not permitted to press forward to Constantinople, or to gain a great addition to her power. Once on the Bosporus a "Greater Bulgaria" would prove an unsafe factor to the Russian aims; therefore Bulgaria was first called back and then defeated with Russian assistance.

What was Austria's interest in this game? Her trade is mostly Oriental. Wherever the Russians go, the open door is closed. The looming up of a big Power on the southerly frontier meant the tearing from her of the Slav parts—a very great danger that in fact necessitated, as every one knows, a huge addition to the Austrian and German armaments in 1913. She could not split up her Slav parts without falling all to pieces. There are Rumanians in the east of Hungary; there are Serbs on the Hungarian frontier on the Danube; there are a great many of the same population in Bosnia-Herzegovina; and then, also, the great Bohemian crown land for the most part is Slav. She had a large interest in maintaining her treaty rights with Turkey. She knew of the relentless hatred of the Serbs, who could not enlarge their frontiers to the west, and the known Russian enmity that barred her way to the Ægean Sea. Austria's situation became unbearable, and the assassination of Serajevo was just a spark that fell into the powder-cask.

But could Germany forsake Austria in her struggle for life that she had to take up? In the first place, Germany had been the ally of Austria ever since 1879, for the avowed purpose of preventing Russian aggression. Then Austria is not only peopled with Slav and Hungarians—she is also a German nation—more than twelve million of her people (about twenty-five per cent.) being German by race, by language, and by civilization. The partition of Austria would have left that great part of the real kernel and backbone of the Dual Monarchy in a hopelessly impotent and reduced position, surrounded on two sides by people of a different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race, inferior cultural attainments, and an easy prey to either of the contending factors. If the bonds of nationality, of language and culture, count for anything, Germany could not do that. And then, for her, there is another consideration of equal importance: Germany is a nation of fast-increasing population. She is industrial for the most part. She can keep her people busy at home only by having the markets of the world open to German goods. The closing of the Bosporus by Russia would have excluded her enterprise for ever from Western Asia, where she has been doing so much cultural work, and would have left the enormous Asiatic Continent to be further divided by England and Russia. All her just endeavors to peaceful commercial expansion would have been thwarted. On the other hand, the breaking up of Austria would have meant a complete isolation of Germany, with the enormous danger of an array of the Powers against her as seen in this war. So when Austria had to fight, as she had, Germany had to join with her.

We now come to the situation of France. It is said that she is fighting for revenge, and revenge is generally interpreted as retribution for the taking of Alsace-Lorraine. But that is only the outward sign of the decay of French power. For hundreds of years France had been the foremost Power of the European Continent. She was dictating its politics, she dominated the cabinets of Europe, from the times of Richelieu and Louis XIV.; from the time of Mazarin to the French Revolution; from Napoleon I. to Talleyrand's splendid work at the Vienna Congress and as Ambassador at the Court of St. James's, down to finally Napoleon III., the French Court was always the focus of splendor, might, and imperiousness. France has been, as she styles herself always, *la grande nation*, and it was a rude awakening and a terrible disappointment when the power of United Germany definitely removed her from that position. Given to good living and comfort, and to the two-children system, she continuously lost ground as against parsimonious, frugal, and inventive Germany. The well-known tendency of Germany for family life and the raising of children under the home roof made the difference in population every year greater. Thirty-eight millions in 1870 in France and a like number in Germany changed into thirty-nine millions in the former and into nearly seventy millions in the latter country. So she felt that she could not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold her own single-handedly, and she had to seek alliances which were not to be had for the asking. She found an ally in the Russian antagonism toward Germany that had sprung up ever since Bismarck had made himself the "honest broker" of Europe at the Berlin Congress, when the prize of her war against Turkey was definitely wrested from her. France had to engage to finance Russian railways, Russian state needs, and Russian armament. She had to loan to Russia more than ten billion francs of her savings in order to maintain that friendship. So there were two motives that caused France to draw nearer and nearer to Russia and to become the bonded ally to a Power so foreign to French culture and French ideals. The first motive was to regain her lost position in Europe. The second was the fear of losing her savings invested in Russia. Had she stood out, Russia would not have hesitated to cancel all her indebtedness to France by a single stroke of her autocratic pen. It was this sort of entanglement that brought France into this European war.

Let us come to England.

It has been maintained that her jealousy against German trade, German sea power, German industry, and German expansion had been guiding factors. They had certainly a very great deal to do with the public feeling in England, and it is public sentiment to which Great Britain, more than any other nation, thinks she must listen. Sir Edward Grey, in a despatch, on August 1st (reprinted under No. 123 of the English "White Book"), to Sir Edward Goshen, makes clear this point. He says that the German attitude with regard to Belgium affected feeling in England. If Germany could give the same assurance as France had given, it would materially contribute to relieve anxiety and tension in England. If Belgian neutrality was violated, it would be extremely difficult to restrain public feeling in that country. "He [Count Lichnowsky] asked me whether if Germany would promise not to violate Belgian neutrality we would engage to remain neutral. I replied that I could not say that. . . . Our attitude would be determined largely by public opinion." He did not think that they could give a promise of neutrality on that condition *alone*. The German Ambassador pressed him as to whether he could not formulate conditions on which England would remain neutral. He even suggested that the integrity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France and her colonies might be guaranteed, but Sir Edward Grey said that he felt obliged to refuse definitely any promise to remain neutral on similar terms, and that England must keep her hands free.

It is clear that public opinion in England, while being strongly influenced by the Belgian case, had other grudges against Germany. That is why Sir Edward Grey would not even formulate conditions to remain neutral if Belgian neutrality was being guaranteed. I wonder why this significant despatch is always disregarded by the Americans formulating a case against Germany. While it is true that this British-German rivalry certainly played a very considerable part in the policy of the British Cabinet, I do not think it was decisive. The English policy for ages past, adapted to the isolation of the British Isles, has been the maintenance of European equilibrium, by which is meant that England saw to it that Europe was arrayed into two hostile camps, as equally matched as possible, while she kept her hands free in order to throw her weight into the balance of that party that served her aims best. Therefore, when France had to go to war as soon as Russia became involved, she was in great fear that this equilibrium might be seriously disturbed. I believe Sir Edward Grey wanted peace under existing conditions; the equilibrium was there, and England had nothing to complain of. But if war was to be declared, France being much the weaker, it was to be expected that she would be thoroughly crushed by the German war machine and the equilibrium would have gone for good. Even if France was not despoiled of any of her provinces or possessions, yet she would have been materially so much weakened that she could not play any further part in the European concert. So England's interest was bound up with France remaining a comparatively strong Power. And so, with eyes always on that point, England became entangled beyond what she ever expected. As early as November 22, 1912, Sir Edward Grey, without the knowledge of the Cabinet, exchanged letters with the French Ambassador, acknowledging an arrangement whereby the entire French fleet was sent to the Mediterranean to protect the joint interests there, while the English fleet was concentrated in the North Sea. This arrangement could not be changed when the war broke out. Sir Edward Grey said that much in a speech on August 3rd

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the House of Commons. He was bound to protect French coasts and had to see to it that the French were not being reduced. It will now be understood why the English always talk of the necessity of reducing Germany to a second-rate Power by crushing out her military force. That is the only way by which France can be strengthened and England can return to her former policy. She was afraid of German expansion, as of the German inroads into English trade. But that was not paramount. Paramount was the English interest of re-establishing a state of things such as had been the case before 1870. She knows that her next big struggle will be with Russia over her Asiatic possessions, and must keep her hands free for that, and be reassured of the state of Europe. Therefore, no matter what happened before war broke out, as soon as it was certain to come she had to be a party to it.

I stated the case of Germany as I proceeded. I have now to speak of three Powers that play a smaller rôle in the conflict: First, there is Japan. Next to Russia, Japan has been the most expansive Power, and since 1894 has acquired possession and control of three times what she had before that date. She is now out for the coast of China, pretending to fight the Germans in Kiao-Chou, while at the same time taking possession of all the railways from Peking south to the valley of the Yangtse. She means to dominate that part of China, just as she dominates the southern part of Manchuria, by controlling all the lines of communication, fortifying her position along those railways by putting in garrisons under the name of "railway guards," and definitely ousting European competition that cannot be maintained against the craft and frugality of the yellow man. That is a side issue whose bearing upon America I do not feel called upon to detail.

Then there is Portugal. Here there is a remarkable double play. While England is apparently assisting the Republic of Portugal and egging her on to go to war, by telling her that German expansion means a loss of Portuguese colonies, she is harboring at the same time in her confines the ex-King of Portugal; is the centre of the royalist revolutionary movements against Portugal, and she feels assured that whichever way this struggle turns she will have all the advantage.

Then I come to the case of Belgium, that made so much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stir in the United States. She also is not to be exonerated from blame. Belgium feels much safer as a buffer state in the interests of England, who she believed would maintain her independence and integrity, as England cannot permit any first-class Power to control the entrance to the North Sea. Belgium belongs geographically to Germany. So by playing upon Belgian fear that she, whose main harbor, Antwerp, is a natural outlet to the growing German industries, would become a German vassal, and by promising Belgium British help, assisting her in her fortifications, she made Belgium resist the two overtures of the German Chancellor, who promised integrity and indemnity in case Germany marched through Belgium. I will not dwell here on the treaty relations which Mr. Gladstone himself called a most complicated affair, and which he thought must not be maintained if they were against the English interests at the time when the occasion of acting under the guarantee arose. It was Great Britain's interest that this neutrality should be kept, but it was certainly not England's reason for the war, as is made clear by the despatch of Sir Edward Grey cited above.

The German Government has been taxed with considering treaties as "scraps of paper." That is certainly not the German record, nor the German position toward treaties. But this treaty was a scrap of paper; the English on their side did not put any faith in it, nor were they prepared to maintain it under all circumstances. They did not consider it enforceable in 1870, and replaced it by new arrangements between the North German Confederation and France. The Chancellor regretted very much that he had to go through Belgium, although Belgium had broken that treaty herself in spirit and in letter. The American doctrine is that treaty obligations must not and cannot be kept if it is against public policy (*vide* unanimous judgment rendered in the Chinese Exclusion Treaty cases by the United States Supreme Court, printed in Vol. 130 of *U. S. Reports,* page 600). And I must say that it is one thing to ask a private individual to keep an obligation, even when suffering great loss and inconvenience, and another if a statesman responsible for sixty-six million people who are in danger of losing their liberty, national existence, and civil rights takes upon himself to encounter criticism by the world at large. Belgian neutrality was an instrument played very skilfully by Sir

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Edward Grey as a moral proposition. In fact, it was a proposition of public interest also for England, and neutrality had to be protected if England wanted to retain a dominant position on both sides of the Channel.

Then there is another aspect of the matter that Americans generally overlook. They always talk of Germany and Russia and the other countries as doing such and such things. They talk of statesmen having acted so or otherwise. They forget that behind these statesmen, behind these countries, there are hundreds of millions of people who have a life and a volition of their own. They forget that most of these states are guided and conducted by sets of people who do not appear very much in the foreground. The Servian people by itself has probably not been very willing to go to war again after the experience of 1912. There was a Crown Prince who was the real ruler behind the throne, and the military and clan party who, as it is now proven beyond any possibility of refutation, engineered a plot against the Crown Prince of Austria, spread a large propaganda, and drove the people to war by telling them that Austria wanted to exterminate the Servian people, notwithstanding the explicit guarantee of Austria that she would not take any Servian territory. The same is the case in Russia. The Russian people are very illiterate and uncultivated. Seventy out of one hundred Russians do not know how to read and write. They do not read papers. They follow the dictates of their clergy, the call of their " white " Czar, and implicitly believe what they are told. There is a military clique in Russia that has been constantly pressing upon the peaceful Czar that now was the time to get all the things they had wanted for so long. The Czar refused, and closed himself up for four days. The Minister of War was not in the councils of the war party, so it happened that the Russian mobilization went forward without the Czar's signature and after the Minister of War had given his word of honor that no mobilization had been ordered. This Grand-Ducal party finally got the upper hand, as reported by the Belgian Minister in St. Petersburg on July 30th to his Home Government, after having received the assurance that England would second France in case of a conflict. And this was before the Belgian incident ever arose.

Similar conditions obtained in Austria. The Archduke Francis Ferdinand had always cherished the plan of recon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciling the Slav portion of the Empire by making out of the Dual Monarchy a tripartite arrangement. Hungary, that would thereby lose most, was much against it. So when the Archduke was out of the way and the Hungarian Premier pressed for a more determined policy, the old emperor was not able to make the same strong resistance.

And the same holds good also in respect to England. Sir Edward Grey never communicated the exchange of letters with the French Ambassador in 1912 to his colleagues. But when this matter could no longer be kept back, the Cabinet was amazed. Three of its members stepped out at once, declaring that they would not have anything more to do with the Government. They were Mr. John Burns, Lord Morley, and Mr. Trevelyan, who in a letter to his constituents in Ellford declared that they had always been told that the hands of England were entirely free, that they were not obligated to France in any way, but that he had found out, to his disgust, that England was so hopelessly entangled that she had to go to war. The leader of the Socialist party, Ramsay McDonald, most severely criticized the Administration upon the same grounds, and the Liberal member of Parliament, Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, wrote a letter most severely arraigning Sir Edward Grey on his double dealing. But there were some hotheads, like Winston Churchill and Lloyd George, and then there was the enormous danger of the Irish civil struggle that loomed up on the horizon and whose consequences could absolutely not be foreseen in a time of European conflagration. The Irish leaders were induced, by the passing of a Home Rule Bill of a very deceptive kind, to come to the aid of the Government, upon the ground of patriotism and national danger.

The only nation that is absolutely united to its Government is Germany. She knows, and it will be apparent to any thoughtful reader of the above recital, that all the nations around her want something of her—have an interest in the struggle, and are willing to fight under all circumstances. Russia wants Constantinople and the weakening of the Austrian monarchy. England demands the reduction of Germany to a subordinate Power; France, the re-establishment of her former dominating rule of Europe. Surely, no one would consider Germany so insane and absolutely bereft of common sense that she should have desired and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permitted all the nations in whose way she had been to fall on her, thereby catering for her own destruction? Will it be believed that a nation that has been constantly striving for peace, the only one of all European nations that has not had war for forty-four years, has never expanded except peacefully, never acquired territory except by treaty, knowing that a combination of much stronger Powers threatened her from all sides, would go wilfully and light-heartedly to fight nearly the whole world? And what had she to gain if she were victorious?

So I put my case, not on doubtful evidence, or on the teachings of people who want to make believe to the American public that diplomacy is the school of truthfulness and that diplomatic papers are a clean source of information, but I put my case, and I rest it, on the history of Europe, on the forces that have been at work, not since the 28th of July, but for many years past, whose self-interest I have made evident and whose powers, aims, and ambitions are explained—an explanation which the average American scholar will be able to verify every day. Germany is united because she knows that she is fighting for her very life and existence, and against Powers who wish to reduce her to her former state of impotency and weakness and to undo the great work of Bismarck, to crush, under Slav dictation, forces that have been a boon to the civilization and advancement of the world.

BERNHARD DERNBURG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEUTRALITY OF BELGIUM

BY PROFESSOR A. G. DE LAPRADELLE, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

PERPETUAL neutralization is the condition of a State for ever removed and protected from all hostilities. After a sketchy attempt to apply neutralization to the Island of Malta, the legal notion of perpetual neutralization made its appearance in history in 1815. At this date Switzerland was neutralized. In 1831 came Belgium's turn; in 1867, that of Luxembourg; in 1885, that of the Congo Free State. The perpetually neutral State renounces the right to make war, and, in consequence, the right to contract alliances, even purely defensive ones, because they would drag it into a war to succor an ally or would place it in a situation of political dependence toward such an ally if the neutral State's ally should promise it succor without exacting reciprocity. All danger, then, of aggression on the part of the neutral State being avoided in this manner, the neutral State obtains in return from other States their promises to refrain from attacking it. This is the essential difference between temporary neutrality and perpetual neutrality. When two States declare war on each other, other States may at their will participate or not in the war, just as each of the belligerents may if it will implicate them in it; neutrality, then, is nothing but a precarious régime, since it is at the mercy, either of the neutral State or of one of the belligerents to end at any instant. Hence simple neutrality has been designated as temporary neutrality. On the other hand, a perpetually neutral State, Switzerland, Belgium, or Luxembourg, is legally restrained when a war breaks out, from taking part in it. But again, none of the belligerents may involve the perpetually neutral State in the consequences of the war, consequences which include the passage through its territory, without which prohibition one of the belligerents, menaced by the advent of the enemy, would naturally be led

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to go to meet its enemy on neutral ground, which would be sure to provoke a battle exactly where it should be avoided.

The neutralized State, assured of never being, either directly or indirectly, implicated in a war, sees opening before it, if it remains peaceful and loyal, the hope of a peace guaranteed by law.

Noble thinkers, desirous of restraining war by every means, have asked themselves if precisely this perpetual neutrality, developed from country to country, does not contain in it the surest means of bringing about, through a continual progress, the reign of peace among nations. The Interparliamentary Peace Union turned its efforts to this purpose, while many minds in Holland, in Denmark, in Sweden, and in Norway were getting their bearings in that direction. In order to facilitate the passing of the European States from temporary neutrality to perpetual neutrality the Russian jurist, De Martens, had ingeniously developed the opinion that perpetual neutrality which, up to the present moment has always been the result of an agreement between the neutral State and other Powers, could, and from now on should, come into effect by a simple one-sided proclamation of the State that is a candidate for neutrality. On the other hand, jurists of neutral countries, such as Nys of Belgium, have endeavored to relax as much as possible the rigor of the conditions which perpetual neutrality imposes upon the sovereignty of a State. While the perpetually neutral State is incapable of concluding a customs union with a State not perpetually neutral (for a customs union leads to political union), one might foresee a possibility of its entering into a customs union with a neighboring State that was also neutralized, a fact which from the beginning relieves the economic union of all political intent or effect.

It was then possible to found the greatest hopes on the régime of perpetual neutrality, made wisely supple enough not to interfere with economic expansion. But in order that political régimes instituted as a result of juridical speculation may be defined, strengthened, and extended, they must be capable of sustaining the test of time. A system created to put a check to war cannot be judged, except in the course of a war. In 1870 the rigorously respected neutrality of Switzerland, Belgium, and Luxembourg was successful in localizing hostilities. But at that time there did not yet exist the barrier of forts between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France and Germany which, by making the attack difficult, has led the aggressor to invade neutral territory; for beyond, thanks to the confidence reposed in treaties, he knew he should find no barrier but that of a rampart of living men. So in considering the future of perpetual neutrality after the inconclusive precedent of 1870, it was the terrible eventuality of a Franco-German war which must be regarded as the decisive proof to settle the value of the institution.

The proof has come; it has surpassed all expectations, even the most pessimistic.

Germany has violated not only the neutrality of Luxembourg, which she had recognized and guaranteed, but that of Belgium, also recognized and guaranteed by her. Not only has she not held herself bound by the treaties she had formally signed, but she has shown the most singular misunderstanding of the substance even of these treaties. She proposed to Belgium to allow her troops to pass through her territory peacefully, offering to pay for all service demanded and given, first to the inhabitants, and then to the nation. That was acting as if neutrality were created in the exclusive interest of the neutralized nation, by virtue of a separate contract with each of the Powers who have recognized and guaranteed its neutrality. Just the contrary is the case; the neutrality which results not from a particular contract with each of the Powers, but from a collective contract with all of neighboring or interested States, possible belligerents, is a régime which, born of the will of several Powers in the common interest of the neutral State and of these Powers, cannot, legally, be done away with, except by their common agreement. Belgian neutrality, sprung from the treaties of 1831 and of 1839, without being, like that of Switzerland, desired by the neutralized nation herself, had been made the condition upon which she was given her independence. After the Powers had, in 1815, reunited Belgium and Holland to form the kingdom of the Netherlands as a barrier to French expansion, they had allowed Belgium to break away and weaken this barrier only on the condition that she herself should constitute another rampart—that of neutrality. Belgium did not, like Switzerland, of her own accord ask for this neutrality; she was obliged to resign herself to accepting against her will; it was for her the price of her independence—the ransom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her liberty. Such being the origin of this neutrality, imposed upon Belgium, not in her own interest, but to protect European peace, how then could Germany make offers to Belgium to renounce in her favor a situation due not exclusively to the idea of protecting Belgian interests, but to the maintenance of European peace? Furthermore, to demand of Belgium to allow the German troops to pass through Belgian territory was not only contrary to perpetual neutrality, it was contrary to temporary neutrality. The Hague Convention of October 18, 1907, on the rights and duties of neutral States, signed by Germany and Belgium, is explicit on this point: "Art. 1. The territory of neutral Powers is inviolable. Art. 2. Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or convoys, whether of munitions of war or of supplies, across the territory of a neutral Power. Art. 5. A neutral Power must not allow any of the acts referred to in Articles 2 and 4 to occur on its territory."

If Belgium's neutrality had been a simple neutrality, purely voluntary, ephemeral, and optional for the neutral State and the other Powers as that of Denmark or Holland, even then Germany could not have demanded of her the passage of her troops, convoys, or munitions, without inviting her to be false to her obligations. Does not such an act imply not only the contempt of perpetual neutrality, but of temporary neutrality as well? To ask passage of her troops was for Germany to associate Belgium with her in the war, to expose her, in the improbable case of her assenting, to a just punishment by the Powers for such treason to her duties. For the Powers, by recognizing her neutrality, had not only the right but the duty to force her to respect it. If the neutrality of Belgium had been temporary, Germany could not, without forcing her to enter into an alliance with her, have demanded passage; such a concession would have been on the part of the neutral State an act of belligerence. Now, alliances cannot be forced. Even if Belgian neutrality had been temporary, Germany could have obtained from Belgium the right of passage only by forcing her to depart from her neutrality. When Belgium refused to accede to Germany's demand, Germany, who declared that she had no hostile intentions toward her, should then have rigidly abstained from action. All the more should she have abstained from asking Belgium

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to violate her neutrality, since it was she who had expressly recognized it, and not only recognized—which obliged her to respect it—but guaranteed it as well, being thus constrained to make it respected by others. So then, when Belgium refused, she was under the strongest obligations to stop short. This was not what happened. No violation of neutrality can be imagined more concrete, more complete, more certain, more disdainful of the institution, more offensive, not only to the independence, but to the honor, of the neutral State than that with which the guardian of this neutrality punished the refusal to betray at her command the most express and well-defined obligations.

In vain can the juridical casuist search, not for a justification, but for an extenuation even, of such an act. In recognizing officially that the neutrality of Belgium had been violated, the German Chancellor thought to bring forward the excuse of necessity—that is to say, the necessity of legitimate defense. Not recent is the philosophy dear to Prussian militarism—which, according to Hegel and Treitschke, places the power of the State above law, morals, and even honor. Without doubt it affirms that the State is never bound by an obligation to respect that which would prove a danger to its security. But Belgium's neutrality could not imperil Germany, since its end and effect was precisely to prevent France from surprising by a flank attack the line of German fortresses. What Belgian neutrality did paralyze was not the German defense, but German *aggression*. It is true that Treitschke and Bernhardi would have us believe the State should preserve intact, not only its powers of defense, but its powers of offense. Nevertheless, this doctrine, menacing alike to the security of weak States and the peace of strong but pacific States, is but a monstrous aberration. To assert that Germany had the right to disregard Belgian neutrality means that Germany had the right to declare war on Belgium, to invade it, to occupy it, to annex it. Such acts may perchance be possible in the higher domain of actual politics; they cannot be justifiable in the realm of justice. Even in order that it may live, a people has no more right to sacrifice another inoffensive people than a man has to kill another innocent man in order that he himself may live. In vain Bernhardi, whose writings were not only a prophecy, but a programme, has declared, that Belgium ceased to be a neutral State by annexing, contrary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the obligations of neutrality, the colony of the Congo. He would have it when, in 1885, the Powers recognized the independence of the Congo Free State under the sovereignty of the King of the Belgians. They permitted Belgium indirectly to indulge in colonial activity, so that the change from the Congo Free State to a Belgian Colony—the mere regularization of an act into a right—could not astonish them; moreover, if it were contrary to the condition of a neutral State to possess a colony, the guarantors of this neutrality should have warned her in regard to it, which Germany assuredly did not do; finally, the consequence of this point of view would have been that the Congo would have ceased to be Belgian, and not that Belgium would have ceased to be a neutral State.

Moreover, the reasoning of Bernhardi has not been sustained by any one. Professor Burgess contented himself in the New York *Times* of October 28, 1914, with pretending that

> between 1872 and 1914 Belgium became what is now termed a World Power; that is, it reached a population of nearly 9,000,000 people, it had a well-organized, well-equipped army of over 200,000 men and powerful fortifications for its own defense; it had acquired and was holding colonies covering 1,000,000 square miles of territory, inhabited by 15,000,000 men, and it had active commerce, mediated by its own marine, with many, if not all, parts of the world. Now, these things are not at all compatible in principle with a specially guaranteed neutrality of the State which possesses them. The State which possesses them has grown out of its swaddling-clothes, has arrived at the age and condition of maturity and self-protection, and has passed the age when specially guaranteed neutrality is natural.

To reason thus, is to forget that the neutrality of Belgium, like all other neutralities (but this more than all the others) was created in the interest, not only of the neutralized State, but of peace. If, as Professor Burgess states, Belgium had become sufficiently strong to make her independence respected against any hostile enterprise of France, how could Germany declare to Belgium that she could not trust to her to defend her against a possible French attack? As for insinuating that Belgium had allied herself with France and England, that was to offer to the Belgian nation and government the most gratuitous of insults. Finally, to pretend that if Germany had not taken the first step in penetrating Belgian territory, France would have preceded her, is first to forget that French mobilization,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slower than German mobilization, would not permit France to get ahead of Germany; second, that to the direct question which Belgium addressed simultaneously to France and Germany, France alone and without delay declared expressly that, faithful to her treaties, she would abstain from any act contrary to this neutrality.

Professor Burgess has doubts, too, not only of the guaranty, but of the recognition by Germany of Belgian neutrality. The treaty by which (May 11, 1839) the German Confederation recognized and guaranteed Belgian neutrality, according to him, could no longer in 1867 bind the North German Confederation, which, by the exclusion of Austria, was substituted for the preceding one, and consequently could not bind the German Empire. No German jurist had ever doubted that the recognition and the guaranty of Belgium were included among the conventional obligations of the German Empire. It is true that in 1870 special agreements took place between England, on one hand, and France and Germany, on the other, to assure the neutrality of Belgium during the war. But no one would pretend that at the expiration of this treaty in 1872 the neutrality of Belgium ceased to be recognized and guaranteed; for the treaty of 1870, whose object was to enforce and practically to assure the complete execution of the pledges made in 1839, could not have as a result the weakening of it. By the treaties of 1870 England promised, equally to France and to Prussia, to join her arms to those of either one or the other of these Powers if her adversary should enter Belgian territory. In 1867 England had declared that in her opinion, in the case of a collective guaranty, each of the guarantors was released from his obligations the instant a single one of them was faithless to her obligation. In 1870 she pointed out to France and to Prussia, co-guarantors, but possible transgressors of Belgian neutrality, that under such a circumstance she would not hesitate to take up arms, thus making the military assistance of the guarantor no longer voluntary, but obligatory. Such being the sense of the treaty of 1870, it is not possible to accept the interpretation which Professor Burgess gives to it. Finally, the treaty of 1839, signed by Prussia and Austria, should have been observed by one of the two and her observance assured by the other, even when the substitution for the German Confederation of the North German Confederation, and later of the German Em-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pire, had transmitted to each of the new bodies of German Federation the obligation which the first of these had expressly affirmed, May 11, 1839.

No doubt can exist of the violation of Belgian neutrality, expressly recognized by M. von Bethmann-Holweg. The German armies in crossing the Belgian frontier dared openly to make the directest and gravest attack against the law of nations ever recorded by history.

But while Luxembourg, deprived by Treaty of London (May 13, 1867) of the power to maintain an army, could not dream of defending herself against such a violation of law, Belgium, in spite of the disproportion of the forces, was in a position to resist. The forts of Liège and Namur—the work of General Brialmont—allowed her, if not to stop, at least to halt the march of the invader, while the two nearest guarantors of her neutrality, England and France, exerted themselves to come up to her assistance; her army, recruited by voluntary enlistments, permitted her to make the defense of her independence a truly national work. Faithful to her word, when Germany, after having recognized and guaranteed the neutrality which she transgressed, showed herself twice faithless to her word, the courage of Belgian people rose to the height of its duty. But this resistance only excited the resentment of the aggressor. Witness Louvain's University destroyed; Malines twice bombarded, although she was without defenses or without inhabitants; witness the murder of peaceful citizens taken as hostages—making Belgium pay dearly for the defense of her neutrality.

In vain, to excuse these new crimes, time-serving arguments would pretend that such acts were the just punishment of a civil population which, enraged with hatred of the invader, did not hesitate to take up arms such as the laws of war disdain. This explanation, frequently advanced for Germany's justification, even if we suppose it founded on fact, cannot be admitted in law. Indeed, the convention adopted at the Hague Convention, October 18, 1907, a convention signed by both Belgium and Germany states: "Article 50. No collective penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible." The principle that every penalty is personal should be applied to every punishment, whether military or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not. But, besides that, it would be an error to consider that in firing upon the invader civilians were acting contrary to law. According to Article 2 of the regulations concerning the laws and customs of war on land, adopted by the Hague Convention, October 18, 1907—" The inhabitants of a territory not under occupation, who, on the approach of the enemy, spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading troops without having had time to organize themselves in accordance with Article 1, shall be regarded as belligerents if they carry arms openly, and if they respect the laws and customs of war." Even if the inhabitants did not carry arms openly, even if they did not respect the laws of war, the aggressor could not lawfully reproach them with this, for under the terms of the Convention, signed by Germany, October 18, 1907, on the rights and duties of neutrals, Article 10 says: " The fact of a neutral Power, resisting, even by force, attempts to violate its neutrality cannot be regarded as a hostile act." The violating of neutrality does not put the neutral State in a state of war, but in a state of defense. In vain did Germany take care to declare war on Belgium; Belgium was not thereby placed in a state of war with Germany, for war is a legal situation, while the aggressive act of a State against which another had refrained from declaring war can only be a war *de facto*. Just as a man, face to face with a criminal, who has attacked him in the street does not need to observe the laws of dueling, even if in the present instance it could be proved—a proof which is legally impossible—that Belgium had in the zeal of her defense, failed to observe the rules of the laws of war, it might still be asserted that, under the present circumstances, she was not obliged to respect them. Such a reflection is a matter of grave import.

In addition to showing the fragility of the most strongly guaranteed neutralities, the cruel history of Belgian neutrality shows likewise the danger to a people of neutrality resting, not only by guarantees, but on the people itself. If neutrality does not exempt the neutral State from fortifying herself in time of peace nor from taking up arms in time of war; if the final consequence of this régime is simply to increase, by his surprise at an unexpected resistance, the exasperation of an enemy, who then carries out his crime with all the fury of his remorse, how then can a nation contemplate the thought not of becoming a neutral State, but even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of simply remaining one? And how if, at the expiration of the great war, Belgium, reinstated in her rights, should wish to be rid of her neutrality, could the Powers refuse to accede to her desire?

If such were to be the case, the experience of the war would be exactly contrary to the institution of neutrality which, condemned henceforth by experience, would have to be erased from history. Such a conclusion cannot be admitted. However quickly it comes into the mind, it must be ejected from it still more promptly and surely. If Belgium, her frontiers invaded simultaneously by two belligerents, had not been supported by either of these guarantors, then without doubt it might be said that the institution of perpetual neutrality had seen its day. Luckily, such is not the case. If Germany had had the same regard for right which France showed, Belgium would be at this moment happy and prosperous. While Germany forgot her promises, so far as to ignore the neutrality which she had not only recognized, but guaranteed, England did not hesitate to shoulder all her responsibilities. And the fury of the Imperial Chancellor when he learned that England still heeded "the scrap of paper" awakens the idea that if she had foreseen this possibility Germany would surely have halted before violating Belgian neutrality; the fear of the guarantor had been for her the beginning of wisdom. If Belgium is now suffering more than any people has ever suffered, it does not mean that in the mass of legal institutions that of neutrality is particularly fragile or more particularly imperfect, but that international law is at this moment too weak to resist the audacious onslaught of those Powers whose military pride has perverted their sense of right and whose devouring ambition has corrupted their sense of justice.

Belgium's cruel experience need not divert the hopes of the pacifists from the organization of neutralized States. It ought rather lead the nations to the widening of the system of the recognition and guarantees of neutrality. At this moment international law holds that two neutral States may not ally themselves together for the defense of their neutrality. It is a principle that a perpetually neutral State can only recognize, not guarantee, the neutrality of another State; this is the case of Belgium in relation to Luxembourg. After the war we shall have to see if this doctrine be not too narrow; if, in order to make neutrality an institution which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be a real protection of national independence and the generator of world peace, it is not the time to permit to perpetually neutral States—the only guarantors of neutrality of whose disinterestedness it is possible to be absolutely certain—to guarantee one another mutually: the alliance, the real union of two neutralized States would then become possible. Neutralized Holland could conclude with Belgium, under the form of a reciprocal guaranty, the treaty of alliance which in the present state of the legal doctrine is forbidden her. Scandinavian neutrality could, understood in this manner, uphold that of Belgium and Holland; the neutrality of Switzerland, which geographically linked with that of Holland by a chain of other neutral States, could also enter into this system of reciprocal guarantees. Finally, the peace of the world requires that the numbers of the guarantors of neutralized States be increased. Every nation that is truly pacific and strong ought to feel that its duties toward peace and law increase by reason of its power and authority in the world. If the United States had guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium, is there to be found in all her boundaries one man who believes that in the present instance it would not now be respected?

A. G. DE LAPRADELLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESS IN WAR-TIME

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

War and journalism have the common characteristic of being necessary evils, though the particular form of calamity which the former represents is sporadic, whereas the latter is endemic. But beyond being world-wide and apparently inevitable nuisances the two professions have so little identity of nature or interests as to be predestined enemies. War is as old as the hills, and though there can never be anything like finality in the study of it, still its principles, its effects, its natural history, its philosophy have by now been fairly well determined. But journalism still awaits its philosopher, awaits, I mean, some one who will work out the action and reaction of the new and tremendous power of organized publicity upon the general scheme of things. We are still too near to the eruption of this strange force that has burst upon the world to be able to assess its significance or formulate its relations to life and government and society. A generation still lives which saw the birth of journalism in its present form. It is the product of a quick succession of astounding inventions. The railroad, the cable, the telegraph, the telephone, the rotary press, the linotype, the manufacture of paper from wood-pulp, these are the discoveries of yesterday that have made possible the journal of to-day. But already the Press has taken its place among the permanent social forces. We see it visibly affecting pretty nearly all we do and say and think, competing with the churches, superseding Parliaments, elbowing out literature, rivaling the schools and universities, furnishing the world with a new set of nerves. What marks out our age from all others is precisely this ubiquitous phenomenon of publicity. The ancient world had religion, art, law, commerce, and war. But journalism, the reading habit, the penetration of the printed word—these are peculiarly mod-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern accessories. The whole world of to-day lives in a glass house with all the electric lights turned on and a reporter at each keyhole and staring through every pane; and it is odd that nobody, to the best of my knowledge, has yet attempted to trace out the consequences of this new and pervasive force, to define its nature and functions, and to establish its place and prerogatives by the side of those other influences that were equally operative in the past as in the present. It does not need much perspicacity to foresee that the problem of how to deal with publicity, especially the publicity of the Press, and to adjust the relations between journalism and the private citizen, on the one hand, and the State, on the other, is going to be one of the big problems of the future.

In one supremely vital sphere of national energy the past ten years have seen a decided approach toward just such an adjustment as I believe is pretty sure to extend to other phases of life. War and journalism touch at innumerable points and in almost every case, up to the struggle between Russia and Japan, the points of contact were also points of conflict, and not, as they should and might have been, of co-operation. What we are now witnessing in Europe, in the form of a very rigorous and vigilant censorship of the Press, is an effort on the part of some of the most enlightened democracies in the world to assert the supremacy of the State over this novel and disturbing power of publicity. It was time that some effort of the kind was made. War brings out, as nothing else can, the perils of an unrestricted Press. Secrecy is of the essence of successfu. journalism. Publicity is of the essence of successful journalism. How is a common ground to be found or manufactured between these abrupt opposites? How is a belligerent to prevent the publication of naval and military movements, the disclosure of which may fatally impair the chances of victory? How is one to reconcile the freedom of an uncensored and irresponsible Press with the concealments, the disguises, and the false scents on which may depend not merely the fortunes of a campaign, but the fate of a nation? Some ten years ago, in what proved to be his valedictory speech as First Lord of the British Admiralty, Lord Selborne emphatically recognised the magnitude of this problem. "I am not exaggerating," he declared, "when I say that the most patriotic journalist, without a thought that he was doing his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country any harm, might, in the day or two which precedes war, publish news which might mar the whole issue of the naval campaign of this country."

That sounded like, but it was not, the language of rhetoric. It has happened a score of times in naval and military history that a belligerent has found in his enemy's Press an invaluable, though, of course, unconscious ally. Nor are the instances that one might give all of modern date. Even in the pre-telegraph days, even in Napoleonic wars, information that it was vital to conceal on the one side and equally vital to learn on the other became public property through the columns of an unthinking and unimportant Press; and the dangers of such a situation have, of course, since then been indefinitely increased by every new addition to the means of communication. In the Peninsular War the letters written home by British officers and published in the London newspapers became Napoleon's most trustworthy source of intelligence. In the Emperor's correspondence one constantly finds him basing instructions to his lieutenants on information gleaned from English journals. So serious was the leakage that Wellington had to issue a severe warning to his officers in the shape of a General Order, and, according to Maxwell, kept the plans of his famous lines at Torres Vedras to himself, divulging them neither to the Secretary of State nor to his generals. In the Crimean War it is exceedingly doubtful if Sebastopol would have been fortified at all had it not been for the clamor in the French and English Press that it should be made an object of attack. Sherman's march to the sea owed its inception to his quick utilization of news supplied him by the Southern Press, and it was through the same hospitable source that Grant was able to follow his progress through Georgia and meet him with supplies when he reached the coast. At the very opening of the Franco-Prussian War the German Staff, by a diligent reading of the French papers, was able to ascertain the composition and strategical disposition of all the French corps. A few weeks later, at a time when the German cavalry had lost touch with the French troops, the supremely important information was derived from the French Press that MacMahon was moving from Châlons to effect a junction with Bazaine. No suspicion that such was his intention had apparently crossed the mind of the General Staff; it took all the efforts of the French Press to con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vince them of the fact. Once convinced, however, they swung their armies round to the northwest and within a week Napoleon had capitulated at Sedan. During the Spanish-American War every move and intention of the American naval and military authorities was published immediately in the American Press; it was not in the least the fault of their journalists that the Americans did not meet with a resounding disaster.

But the struggle which best exemplifies the perils of an unrestricted Press as well as the advantages of a restricted one was that between Russia and Japan. All the details of the Russian mobilization, of the despatch of the various units to the front, their passage of the Urals, their arrival at Baikal, and afterward at the theater of operations, were published in the Russian Press; and the Japanese were able in this way to keep themselves constantly and accurately informed of Kuropatkin's reinforcements. When the Russion squadron left Vladivostok in August, 1904, the news of its departure filtered through St. Petersburg and was published in the London dailies. It was promptly cabled to Japan, and Kamimura was enabled to intercept the force and defeat it. The Japanese, on their side, as every one recalls, made secrecy, just as they made sanitation, an offensive and defensive weapon of extraordinary potency. They took no chances. Least of all did they run the desperate risk of allowing the movements of the fleets and armies to be described or hinted at in the public Press. Whatever the Russians learned of their intentions was gathered without Japanese assistance. When matters were nearing but had not reached the crisis, the Japanese Government issued a comprehensive list of topics, embracing every detail of naval and military preparations, that the papers were forbidden to mention. Journalism in Japan became almost a sinecure; you either published nothing or you went to jail. It is not, indeed, too much to say that the Japanese won command of the sea by first winning command of their pens and tongues. Could they have surprised the Russian fleet in Port Arthur if every Japanese journal had announced the sailing of the Japanese squadrons a couple of days beforehand? Could they have entrapped Rojdesvensky if Togo's whereabouts had been divulged by the Tokio Press? Could Oyama have swept the Russians beyond Mukden if every detail of his numbers, his reinforcements, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position of his armies had been published for all the world to read? Nothing in that conflict struck one as more wonderful than the calm announcement by the Japanese Admiralty of the loss of a first-class battle-ship a year or so after the catastrophe had occurred. Until then not a word of the disaster had appeared in the Japanese Press. The facts were probably known, because rumors of them reached Europe. But the rumors were always promptly denied, the mystery was never once lightened, and it was not until after Tsushima that the Russians and the world at large learned the truth. And that was but the climax of a policy that knew no variation from the first shot in the war to the last. There is no need to enlarge on its obvious common sense. But I may perhaps add that the precautions which Japan found it necessary to take in her remote and comparatively unfrequented seas are ten times more incumbent upon us in Great Britain who occupy the busiest spot in the world's most crowded thoroughfare.

Yet until the present war we took no precautions whatever. Consider the conduct of the British Press at the time of the Fashoda crisis and the Dogger Bank episode. Nothing was concealed on either occasion. Every card was held face up, exposed to the full view of the world. Through thoughtlessness or ignorance or misdirected enterprise the London papers divulged the movements of British squadrons in a way that played directly into the hands of the other side. "Our own correspondent's" contribution to the Dogger Bank incident, when war with Russia seemed a matter of hours, was a telegram from Gibraltar notifying all whom it might concern that four vessels of the British squadron had been detached and were steaming under full pressure for the North Sea—a piece of news which, had war ensued, might have led to disastrous consequences. The whole world was informed that the British Home Fleet was off the Orkneys, the armored-cruiser squadron under refit, many of the ships being in dock, and that the Mediterranean squadron was in the North Atlantic. Now that surely was neither business, efficiency, sanity, or anything else but just our muddling, haphazard way of doing things. Americans who chafe—they cannot chafe half as much as we do in Great Britain—under the stringency of the present British censorship, and who not only accuse but convict it—a not very difficult matter, I fear—of endless stupidities, must bear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in mind from what a state of reckless chaos it has rescued us, and how successfully it has fulfilled its prime purpose of preventing the publication of any item of news that could be of service to the enemy. So far as I am aware, not a single point has been gratuitously given away. Amid all the blundering absurdities of the Press Bureau it can at least claim that the most diligent reading of the British papers since the war began would have failed to reveal the whereabouts of a single ship or the strength or movements of a single troop. A censorship is just as alien to British as to American ways and ideas. But the British papers, without exception, have voluntarily submitted to its imposition with patriotic patience and self-denial. Every scrap of news that could possibly give information to the enemy has been remorselessly "killed." Americans have only to imagine their own Press similarly gagged to judge the greatness of this achievement. They have only to recall the behavior of their papers during the Spanish-American War to realize that, whatever may be the shortcomings of the British Press Bureau, it has completely succeeded in its main object, that of suppressing disclosures that would be useful to the Germans. I have shown by the history of other wars that this is one of the indispensable elements of military, and still more of naval, success. To have compassed it with the microscopic comprehensiveness which has been attained in Great Britain is an achievement that may fairly be held to offset many deficiencies.

The trouble is, however, that the military mind is apt to stop at that point. When the Press is effectually muzzled the soldier is not only satisfied, but thinks he has solved the whole problem. That may be all very well in countries like Germany or Bulgaria or Japan. In those lands not only is the Press comparatively without influence, but compulsory and universal military service is the established custom. And in all matters touching on war and its preparations and prosecution, there is an immense gulf between the nations that have and the nations that do not have conscription. It is a gulf that in its way is at least as profound as the difference between a free State and a slave-holding State, or between a Moslem and a Christian community. It is a fundamental difference that affects and transforms all values, and nothing is more futile than for a British soldier to point to the example of Germany or Japan as one that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should necessarily be followed in the totally different circumstances of Great Britain. When he demands that he shall be left free to wage war as the Germans wage it and to publish just as much or as little of its progress as he thinks fit, it is necessary to remind him that Great Britain is not Germany. Both England and the United States are blessed with systems of government that give to the Press a power that is inconceivable in countries where everything is subordinated to preparing for success on the day of Armageddon. The Press with us not only disseminates news, but shapes the thoughts of the nation more constantly and with greater effect than any other instrument, and in war-time especially, when the public mind is excited and opinion exceptionally fluid, its influence is enormously enhanced. That is a condition with which the military and naval authorities have to reckon, or ought to reckon, in devising any sort of a Press censorship. They should remember that in gagging the Press they are gagging not only a news agency, but a molder of public opinion, and they should remember, too, that public opinion, in its turn, reacts nowadays with democratic decisiveness upon the policies of Governments and upon the operations of the naval and military commanders appointed to carry out those policies. It reacts upon them both favorably and unfavorably. On the one hand, a firm and intelligent support of a war by public opinion at home is a great fighting asset. It puts nerve into the Government; it greatly facilitates the financial problem and the recruiting and reinforcement problems; it furnishes the best substitute obtainable under a democracy for the inspiriting autocracy of a Chatham. On the other hand, public opinion in war-time is often ignorantly heedless in clamoring against individuals, in denouncing measures that are dictated by military necessity, and in agitating for, and often forcing, the adoption of policies or plans of campaign in the teeth of professional judgment. In this as in everything else one has to take the rough with the smooth. The main thing is to have it recognized that with the sort of political constitutions that are possessed by Great Britain and the United States, public opinion is a factor of inestimable power in the conduct of war on a big scale.

This, however, is just what the British Government has failed to recognize. It has been fully alive to the capacity of the Press for harm, but obstinately blind to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capacity for good. No regular war correspondents, for instance, have been as yet attached to the British forces in the field or to the British Navy in the North Sea. Newspapers have sent out correspondents to the area of hostilities at their own risks. The War Office does not countenance them, except to the extent of forbidding them to approach within twenty miles of the firing-line or to describe anything that is not at least five days old. Now that seems to me a wholly mistaken policy. It means, in the first place, that we in England receive no accounts of the fighting from unofficial sources except at second or third hand, mere odds and ends of narrative pieced together from the reports, the necessarily confused and circumscribed reports, of stray combatants. Everybody, of course, realized after the Russo-Japanese War and the struggle in the Balkans that the spacious days were gone when a Russell, a Steevens, a Forbes, or a MacGahan could go to the front, could wander about pretty much as he pleased, and could send home his letters and telegrams with little or no hindrance from the censor. But between that and absolutely suppressing war correspondents there is a vast difference. One half of a correspondent, the half that is concerned with the gathering and transmission of news, must, I agree, be strictly controlled. But the other half of him, the half that, without in any way assisting the enemy, keeps the public at home informed, stimulated, and interested, that criticizes intelligently and, if the need arises, does not hesitate to expose defects that in the interests of the services themselves ought to be exposed, and will not be remedied unless they are exposed, the half that acts as a connecting link between the forces at the front and the nation at the fireside, that instructs the public in the nature of the task on which it has embarked, and by vivid descriptions strengthens the resolutions to see the thing through—that half of a correspondent may be at times something of a salutary nuisance, but he is also an auxiliary of the highest utility. The British people both like and feel they have a right to learn what is being done in their name at the theater of war, and to learn it from independent as well as official sources, and in furnishing them with legitimate news, fair-minded comment, and readable narrative the correspondent who knows his business is rendering no small service to the army and navy as well as to the nation.

Part of the art of war, indeed, in a democratic State must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be to keep the democracy intelligently interested, and for that purpose the war correspondent should be regarded as an indispensable unit in the equipment of any modern British or American army. By not allowing them at the front the British Government has done no service to the army, has cut itself loose from a valuable source of popular sentiment and determination, and has forfeited whatever benefit may be conferred—and in the past a great deal of benefit has been conferred—by the presence at the seat of war of a corps of trained and detached observers who are competent to discuss the problems of strategy, tactics, administration, and policy as they arise. The drama of war, the "sudden shining of splendid names," the deeds of courage, the life, the sufferings, the triumphs or defeats of our forces on land and sea—these are the things that fire the national heart and call forth the enthusiasm and the spirit of sacrifice and steadfastness that will be needed for victory, and the men to win it. At present for large numbers of the English people the war is too distant and too unreal; it has not been brought before their eyes and minds with even a tenth of the proper vividness; the secrecy of its conduct has done nothing to warm the imagination; and I for one certainly believe that had war correspondents from the first been attached to the British forces, there would not at this moment be the slightest difficulty in raising all the recruits that Lord Kitchener asks for. Moreover—and here again the Government has badly failed—in the absence of war correspondents, a prompt and ample supply of official intelligence becomes doubly essential. But the British War Office and Admiralty have been very backward in recognizing this. In the first three months of the war only three despatches from Sir John French have been made public; the curt daily bulletin issued by the French Government is our only regular and official source of news; and while an officer has been attached to the British headquarters for the express purpose of sending home reports of the operations, his narratives are infrequent, often ludicrously trivial, and not particularly well written. The papers show their opinion of them by either cutting them down or heaping upon them the indignity of small type and an obscure position. The whole business, in short, of stimulating popular enthusiasm by means of the Press has been scandalously mismanaged.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Almost equally pronounced has been the failure of the British Government to grasp the importance of the Press as an influence on Imperial and neutral sentiment. India and all the self-governing dominions have rallied magnificently to the side of the mother-land in this struggle for existence. South Africa, which may seem an exception to this statement, is really a confirmation of it, for the rebellion of Maritz, Beyers, and De Wet has served chiefly to evoke the loyalty and good faith of the vast majority of the Boers who fifteen years ago took up arms against Great Britain. To all these communities, and especially to India, the war is an even more dramatic adventure than it is to Great Britain. A wise statesmanship would surely have seen to it that everything that could be done was done to instruct them on the issues involved, to call forth and guide local patriotism, to keep constantly before their minds a picture of the power and resources of the British Empire, and to inform them without delay of the progress of events and particularly of the doings of their own contingents. Little more was needed than to give the London correspondents of the Colonial and Indian papers a free hand, subject, of course, to the necessary restrictions of the censorship. Yet nothing of the kind was done, and the different units of the Empire have been starved of news equally with Great Britain. One wonders, indeed, how any Englishman can have the face to talk of Germany's misreading of the British character when he finds the authorities in and around Whitehall in a state apparently of as great and far less excusable ignorance. They seem to understand war much better than they understand England or the human, harmless emotions that sway the man in the street or his passionate interest in the pomp and *réclame* of such a struggle as is being fought out in France and Belgium. Whereas every Indian and every Canadian, New Zealand, Australian, and South-African paper should be vivid with accounts of what the forces of the Empire as a whole and of each section in it are achieving, this war through the obtuseness of British officialdom is being waged in a disenchanting secrecy and darkness.

But the reflex action of this obtuseness upon opinion in neutral countries has been even more regrettable. There were at the beginning of the war several countries, such as Turkey, Greece, Rumania, Bulgaria, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, standing on the very edge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the whirlpool and liable at any moment to be drawn into it. There was also another country, the United States, whose neutrality was in no danger of being compromised, but whose sympathies all the belligerents were anxious to claim on their side. In each and all of these lands Germany has conducted a zealous and untiring campaign with the twofold object of influencing both sentiment and policy. They have been deluged with official telegrams from Berlin magnifying every German success, painting the condition and prospects of the Allies in the gloomiest colors, and embellishing the facts without hesitation to suit German interests. The Press, pamphlets, ambassadors, professors, and the hierarchy of the German spy system have all been assiduously worked, and the weapons have varied from the sort of interviews and appeals of which Count Bernstorff has been prodigal down to forgery and whole-hearted lies. Articles from the London *Times* that never appeared in its columns, speeches by British Cabinet Ministers that never were delivered, have been spread broadcast over the neutral countries of Europe and over the west of America by German agents. Political, social, and commercial pressure has also been brought to bear unsparingly. Americans must not think from the failure of German methods in the United States that they have equally failed elsewhere. On the contrary, Turkey's entrance into the arena, the long hesitation of Italy to throw in her lot with the Allies, the neutrality of Holland and Denmark, the repression by their rulers of the desire of the Rumanian people, and the decidedly pro-German bias of Swedish sentiment are all very largely the work of Germany's careful, shrewd, and quite unscrupulous propaganda.

No Englishman would wish to see his country countering German intrigue by German methods. Beyond furnishing its ambassadors and ministers abroad with dignified reports that bear on them the stamp of truth, the British Foreign Office has in fact taken hardly any action whatever. There was no reason why it should have done even that. It had at hand a far more intelligent and serviceable instrument than any it could have manufactured itself. London is full of the representatives of all the most influential papers published in neutral countries. With hardly an exception these skilled journalists are well disposed toward the cause of the Allies and anxious to set it before their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countrymen in the most favorable light. They ask nothing from the British Government except the permission to cable to their journals the news as it reaches them. I will not say that this permission has been refused to them, but it has been granted in such a way as to make it almost inoperative. The censorship, in other words, has been carried to such a ludicrous extent and placed in such incompetent hands that news of the most helpful character to British interests has time and again been held up in the offices of the cable companies and prevented from being sent abroad. Urbane fatuity has rarely, I suppose, been carried further in any Government department than in the British Press Bureau and by the half-pay officers who were installed at its orders in the cable companies' offices. These wondrous gentlemen simply blue-penciled everything that came before them. They censored the Prime Minister's speeches and Sir Edward Grey's, the King's messages to India and the Dominions, and even the official pronouncements of the Press Bureau itself. Happily they have now for the most part been dispensed with. But the Press Bureau still continues to fill the cup of vexatiousness to the brim and to furnish the world with a unique example of how the undoubted perils of publicity during war-time may be avoided and its benefits despised or at any rate ignored.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SWITZERLAND AND THE WAR

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES BORGEAUD OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA

In an hour of poetical prophetizing, Victor Hugo wrote an alexandrine which contributed not a little to his popularity in Switzerland:

La Suisse dans l'histoire aura le dernier mot.

The Swiss know well that the name of their country was penned here by the great French poet of the nineteenth century merely to exemplify a commonwealth of the Old World, where union of different races and common pursuit of the high ideals of mankind are aimed at through the medium of democracy. But they are not the less proud of the recognition. One may say the consciousness of the honor which the civilized world generally pays to them by believing in their fitness for such a task is now helping the little Confederation to face one of the hardest trials of its modern history.

To-day, as a century ago, our country, providentially preserved from the horrors of battles and invasion, stands yet in the midst of the conflagration. As in the days of Leipzig and Waterloo, she has to bear, although in peace, the moral distress of war to an extent which precludes comparison in this respect with any other neutral State of Europe.

We are living at the geographical center where the highest summits converge, where the largest rivers of the continent have their sources. We belong to three races, three tongues, three cultures. Our dearest wish is to be the connecting link between them, is to see them concur, to work with them toward the realization of the loftier ends of man. Now suddenly, through a cataclysm—the anonymous authors of which, whoever they be, appear to us burdened with a satanic responsibility—we see races and tongues and cultures arrayed against one another in a gigantic conflict, where war

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has the character of a tremendous international struggle for life. All the nerves of the powerful States around us are strained for the supreme effort, and the two whirlwinds hurled against each other clash over our borders with such violence that we feel on us the chill of the abyss.

To weather the storm, the Republic of the present is far better prepared than the feeble, disheartened Confederation of divided cantons which emerged from the Napoleonic disaster. A federative Union, wisely organized on the solid basis of the Constitution of 1848—a frame of government which borrowed from that of the United States some of its best features—considerably strengthened by the revision of 1874, which successfully effected a far greater concentration of national energies with the help of the people's amendment on the Referendum, to-day's Swiss State may be called politically strong. It carries out the will of the citizens and normally, progressively, realizes its end.

The nation in arms constitutes the defensive force of the country. From his twentieth to his fiftieth year every Swiss is a soldier. Thus the 1st of August, which is now annually celebrated as the National day, in remembrance of the signature of the first Federal Pact in 1291, saw this year the mobilization of 300,000 men, active army (*Auszug*), *Landwehr*, and even *Landsturm*. At that date, the Government's Treasury incurred the heaviest military outlay of our annals: one and one-half million francs per day, which means, if adding to it the personal expenses incumbent upon the men themselves, nearly half a franc for every head of population.

Deeply hurt by the economic crisis and by the sacrifices which meant the sending of such forces to the border, Switzerland has nothing to expect from the issue of the world's conflict, in which her people serve as cover to the flank operations of the adversaries alternately, save the respect of all and the maintenance of the international standing which she conquered peacefully.

Happily enough, the credit of the country is of first rank and unimpaired, its national funds never ceased to be the object of negotiation, remaining comparatively very steady during the worst days of a crisis without precedent. There exists as yet no direct Federal tax, and important monopolies, like that of tobacco, for instance, have been kept in reserve for the case of necessity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the moral sphere the task of the little free, neutral, and central State is still what it was during the nineteenth century, but in consequence of the unification of economic and intellectual intercourse, especially now through the enormous influence of the Press, of the news agencies of great European centers, that task has become incomparably more delicate, more difficult, than in former times. Foreigners will realize something of these difficulties when they consider that the people, whose eagerness for knowledge is proverbial, draw conclusions from their daily reading, discuss, sympathize, sometimes quite diversely because they start from opposite information received in different languages.

It is a conspicuous feature of the present war that it is waged not merely with the iron and fire of armies, but also with the weapons, quite up to date indeed, of disciplined, of trained public opinions. These weapons were placed more or less at the disposal of the General Staffs, who are concerned exclusively in having them serve their plans. As they obtained from their governments the exclusive monopoly of imparting news from the front, the various nations receive the same in special—oftentimes entirely conflicting—versions which follow the boundaries of languages and dominant intellectual influences.

Within the limits of the belligerents' territories this may be advocated as a consequence of martial law, as one of the necessities of modern warfare. But outside, with the neutrals who depend on more than one racial influence, it has the nefarious effect of extending the action of war across their boundaries by encroaching, on the battle-field of thought, upon their declared neutrality. Thus it can be observed that on vital questions of fact, presented in quite contrary versions by the press of the opposed camps, German, French, and Swiss are bitterly divided. It requires all the vigilance of their statesmen, all the prudence of their leading and best-informed intellectuals, to prevent such division becoming a political danger.

On the 1st of October, the Federal Government judged it expedient to issue an *Appeal to the Swiss People*, in which may be found, with the signature of President Hoffmann, such characteristic admonitions as the following:

> In our way of judging events, in the expression of our sympathies for the concerned nations, we ought to observe the utmost reserve, we ought to avoid what could hurt the States and populations involved in the war and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refrain from every kind of partiality. To judge events with restraint and moderation does not imply renouncing sympathies and feelings. The heart of every citizen will continue to beat warmly for those to whom he is bound by peculiarly strong ties or whose fate is, before all, dear to him. It is only when every one observes that rule that we will be able to fulfil the duties which follow from our situation as a neutral State and maintain the good relations of our country with the others. Never was this more urgent than in the present overthrow of Europe, and never more difficult.

We call every citizen, and especially the Swiss journalists of all parties, of all languages, of all sections, to strict moderation. It is the Press which gives expression and direction to public opinion. To it belongs the noble task of keeping down unfettered passions, of opposing tendencies which divide, of exerting everywhere a wise and conciliating influence.

Out of the trial we are enduring will emerge better times of intellectual, economic, and political developments. To that effect, we need the concentration of all the energies of our people. There ought not to subsist in them any irreconcilable opposition of racial feelings. We see the ideal of our fatherland in a community of culture which rises above races and tongues. First of all we are Swiss, and only secondarily Latins or Germans. Above all sympathies for the nations to which we feel tied by common descent we place the welfare of Switzerland, our common good. To that welfare we must subordinate all the rest.

This appeal was heard: for the Federal idea the national feeling is deep-rooted enough in the hearts of our people to insure their enthusiastic response to the first call of their popular magistrates. It has its sources in the historical growth of the Federal State.

When the league of the three small Waldstaetten rose within the Empire in the twilight of medieval history, it was exclusively Germanic. So also was the greater league of the eight cantons up to the end of the fifteenth century. In those times the ideal of the mountaineers' bond was to preserve German liberty, to maintain German democracy against feudalism and Cæsarism. This led them to sever their connection with the Empire which had become the instrument of domination of the House of Austria. After their amazing triumph over Charles the Bold, which made them the first military power of the time, the Swiss acquired Burgundian territories and received into their league Burgundian partners. The Italian wars brought them Latin possessions on the southern side of the Alps. The Reformation, which helped Berne to become, through important western accessions from Savoy, the most powerful canton, considerably added to the weight of Latin elements in a larger confederation, and ultimately the political influence acquired by French thought during the eighteenth century,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially at the end, when Switzerland was revolutionized under the lead of France, profoundly modified the original character of the Swiss State. Its *raison d'être* ceased to be exclusively German, not to become French, but to become international.

Modern Switzerland, ever conscious of her debt to the forefathers, carefully preserving her precious inheritance of liberty and democracy, has the duty to render these instrumental in the pursuit of a still higher ideal, the task which the genius of Victor Hugo poetically described as the climbing of the last summits of history.

The Swiss national idea, no more to be realized by racialism, is a creation of mind and of will, not of race and language. It is the result of ascent, not of descent. No Swiss race exists nowadays, but in spite of racial feuds there is a Swiss mentality, a Swiss union on the basis of which the nation develops and prospers. This fact ought to be emphasized at a time when so many despair of interracial understanding in the Old World. To be faithful to such a human ideal, the Swiss, after successfully trying to remain not morally neutral, as it is sometimes wrongly put, but mentally equitable, have to show their neighbors by deeds that they have at heart the desire to alleviate their sufferings in every way open to them. The activity of the Red Cross inaugurated by the Geneva Convention just fifty years ago is the most conspicuous testimony to that desire.

The small European State which, through the initiative of the sons of its foremost Latin city, had the honor to be the cradle of that great international institution, can quote a charter with articles for mitigating the barbarity of war as far back as the end of the fourteenth century. This document, which was signed by the eight cantons, dates from the times of the purely Germanic league and bears the name of the most romantic victory of its heroic age. It is called the Sempach Charter. By that compact, medieval pillaging is controlled by strict regulations. It is altogether prohibited during a battle. The churches, cloisters, and chapels are placed under the special protection of the Confederates. Burning or plundering of the same is strictly forbidden. Women are to be respected as long as they themselves abstain from taking part in the fighting. This is why that document is also known in our history by the name of the "*Frauenbrief*," or Women's Charter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, as early as 1393, German mountaineers and citizens showed to the world that liberty and democracy, for which they fought so bravely bareheaded and barebreasted against Duke Leopold of Austria and his iron-coated knights, was the liberty and democracy of the future, not of the past. Thus they broke the way which their remote offspring was one day to follow hand in hand with their Latin brethren.

The first International Conference of the Red Cross was held in 1863, under the lead of a special committee of the "*Société genevoise d'utilité publique,*" having in General G. H. Dufour an illustrious and venerated chairman. When in the following year a diplomatic Congress, convened at the invitation of the Swiss Federal Council, adopted the celebrated Geneva Convention, dated the 22d of August, 1864, and signed by twelve States, a treaty not only initiated but really prepared by the same board of commissioners, they were practically confirmed as the "*Comité international de la Croix Rouge.*" That committee of Genevese, of which Henri Dunant, the founder and the pioneer of the generous idea, and Gustave Moynier, the successor of General Dufour in the presidency, were at the start the most active members, has now behind it a never-ceasing activity of half a century, a success which no doubt would have been commemorated this year under the present chairmanship of M. Gustave Ador, member of the Swiss National Council, had not the great crisis in Europe put off any joyful celebration.

The "*Comité international*" was the promoter of the national Red Cross organizations which cover the civilized world, and it now serves for all as a central committee for correspondence and for action. One of its latest moves was a circular address to all belligerent Powers, dated September 19th, reminding them of the twenty-fifth Article of the Geneva Convention, revised in 1906, which places upon the commanders-in-chief of armies the duty of enforcing the strict observance of all the prescriptions of the same. It was issued at the urgent request of the Director of the Austro-Hungarian Red Cross, who sadly enough had to complain that the declared neutrality of the sick and wounded, without distinction of any kind, as well as the protection of the sanitary and personal services of the several States, was not everywhere adequately secured.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the various duties which it has assumed in previous wars, and still performs with an unflinching zeal, the Geneva Committee had lately to add important new ones toward prisoners.

One knows that the Washington Conference of 1912, considering that prisoners of war as well as wounded may be the object of generosity, adopted a resolution according to which special boards should be formed by the several Red Cross organizations for the purpose of collecting and sending to the International Committee of Geneva the relief funds designed for soldiers in captivity. The International Committee, through neutral delegates accredited to the governments concerned, is to insure the remittance of the gifts intended for individuals and distribute the others among the several depots according to the intents of donors, the needs of prisoners, and the instructions of the military authorities. After having reminded all the national committees of the wording of that resolution, the "*Comité international*" proceeded to form a new special office at Geneva which bears the title "*Agence des prisonniers de guerre.*"

The work of this office, which was started in September without funds of any kind and with free postage as its only material facility, was planned more liberally than the strict application of the Washington resolutions would have admitted. It extends to the transmission of the correspondence of prisoners of war with their families, to informing the latter about their dear missing ones, and to a wide field of inquiry not yet exactly defined. When one remembers that prisoners of war are already reckoned by hundreds of thousands, and that more than ten millions of men are in arms, one can form some idea of what such a task instantly became as soon as it was known. Some hundreds of letters were received and answered daily after the first weeks. After the first month, the official figure is from four to six thousand per day. Three hundred persons are now busy at this service. More will certainly be wanted.

The most interesting feature of the enterprise is that the work is done mostly by volunteers. Genevese and foreigners, gentlemen and ladies, compete in offering their services, and offers are so abundant that desks are booked in advance, vacancies being waited for like official berths.

Another new departure in the interest of the people who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are to live under martial law is what is being done now in Switzerland for the sake of the *civil* prisoners of war.

That in every country the non-neutral aliens are detained is known. Of these the individuals who are liable to bear arms in their own country may be assimilated with the military men in captivity and benefit as such from the protection of the Washington resolutions. A special commission of the "*Agence des prisonniers de guerre*" of Geneva undertook the task of corresponding with families and governments for the sake of such prisoners. Their number is great, and still growing as the armies advance and it is deemed expedient to make new arrests.

As to the others—women, children, and men who are not considered to be able to serve in the army or navy of their country—it is clear that the wording of the Washington resolutions do not extend to them. These victims of the state of war are not less worthy of commiseration. On the contrary, being feeble and often destitute, their situation is even more pitiable. The Swiss Government esteemed it to be among the duties of a neutral State to do whatever may be in its power to obviate the sufferings of such unfortunates, and especially, when subjects of neighbor States, to try and mediate for their early repatriation.

According to a decision of the Federal Council, dated September 22d, a Swiss office for repatriation of interned civil people ("*Bureau suisse de rapatriement des internés civils*") was created at Berne under the supervision of the Political Department. France and Germany, through their Legations, have already given their assent. Preliminary negotiations are in progress also with Austria.

Having obtained the lists of persons who are to be sent home, the office has to organize their reception at certain places on the borders; to take care of them, with the help of public benevolence, during their transit through Switzerland and take the necessary steps to secure their being met on their arrival in their own country. Certain questions, for instance, with respect to the standard of discrimination between men who are considered capable of bearing arms and those who are evidently under or above the age of useful service, offer some difficulties on account of the diversity of methods of classification in the countries concerned. However, it is to be hoped that they will be settled to the satisfaction of all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The exchange and repatriation of all male civil prisoners under seventeen or eighteen and above fifty or sixty years, and of women, will be a boon, not only to the exiles, but to the governments themselves, who clearly have cares enough with the concentration of the others.

That Switzerland, although in arms for the safeguarding of her neutrality, may successfully and up to the end remain an oasis of peace and refuge and fulfil her various humanitarian duties, and, even if the fate of war be that of 1871, may be able to bear the exceptionally heavy one of disarming and interning unsuccessful armies, is the present wish of all her sons.

CHARLES BORGEAUD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONALISM IN BOHEMIA AND POLAND

BY HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER

No one can foretell the future political organization of Europe. Traditions, alliances, and antipathies will continue to exert an influence more or less in harmony with the past. There are, however, certain elemental states of mind whose development made the war upon which Europe has entered almost inevitable and which will continue to assert themselves until a political organization in harmony with their demands is accomplished. This war has been called a conflict of races—Pan-Germanism versus Pan-Slavism. The fundamental cause of the antagonism between these two peoples is neither racial nor economic; it is psychological. We call it Nationalism.

Nationalism is the struggle of a group to preserve its own individuality. It is even more elemental than religion itself, and, as in the case of the early Christian church, its growth to gigantic proportions has been fostered by the blind stupidity of rulers who could not see that the way to make it grow was to try to crush it. It is akin to patriotism, but draws its lines according to the group consciousness for a common language and traditions, or the feeling of unity of blood through some common ancestor. It does not correspond to national boundaries, but rather to historic or even imaginary boundaries. It is sentimental rather than rational. In fine, it is the revolt of a people conscious of its unity against control by influences trying to annihilate this consciousness. A familiar example of this spirit is the Irish Home Rule agitation. Nationalism does not express itself so much in antagonism to political supremacy as in resentment against the imposition of cultural influences, of which language is generally the chief instrument.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In older days the victims of war were killed or enslaved; in recent times they have been made subjects. Within a half-century, and most rapidly within the last decade, the whole world has developed a spirit of revolt against the subject condition—whether political or cultural—and the spirit of Nationalism has become dominant. Nationalism has sprung into being in its present form so rapidly that the world has been slow to recognize it as one of the most potent social forces of this generation. Norway long resented the authority of Sweden, and ten years ago peaceably separated from her, and is now officially reviving the language used by the people four hundred years ago before the Danes imposed a foreign language and culture upon her. The Germans, both in the Empire and in Austria, have been ruthless in their efforts to impose their language and ideas upon all who came under their power, with the result that every people in Europe both fears and hates them.

It was the development of the national spirit among the peoples of Southeastern Europe, focused against the efforts to impose upon them German language and culture, that precipitated the present war. The policy of Europe has been the government of various areas and peoples by a few great Powers. Of late years this rule has been maintained with relatively less war than formerly, but a storm has been brewing and has finally broken. Austria has established her dominion over a heterogeneous aggregation of Germans, Poles, Bohemians, Slovaks, Slovenes, Serbs, Croatians, Bosnians, Dalmatians, and Italians. Russia has strengthened her control over Finland and Poland. But, thanks to the new spirit of Nationalism, there has never before been so little assimilation. It has long seemed inevitable that the time could not be indefinitely postponed when disintegration and realignments would change the map of Europe. When Austria appropriated Bosnia and Herzegovina, she gave an impetus to the forces that must eventually lead to her own destruction. While the assassination of the Grand-Duke Ferdinand may not have been desired, it was exactly in harmony with the hostile spirit of the Slavs, who constitute two-thirds of the subjects of Austria. Each Slavic group has a strongly developing Nationalism of its own coupled with the ponderously forming Pan-Slavic consciousness. All the Slavic languages are closely related and serve as a symbol for a closer union of all the divisions. As an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization Pan-Slavism is only an ideal. It was, however, to meet the danger which he foresaw from Pan-Slavism that the German Chancellor raised the unparalleled war tax two years ago, and thereby forced England and France into corresponding increases.

The two largest subject Slavic groups, who have developed Nationalism to the highest degree and have been the most influential in fostering antagonism to the Germans, are the Bohemians and the Poles. The present situation in Bohemia is well described in an address given by Count Lützow in Prague in 1911:

> One of the most interesting facts that in Bohemia and especially in Prague mark the period of peace at the beginning of the nineteenth century is the *revival* of the *national feeling and language*. . . . The greatest part of Bohemia, formerly almost Germanized, has now again become thoroughly Slavic. The National language, for a time used only by the peasantry in the outlying districts, is now freely and generally used by the educated classes in most parts of the country. Prague itself, that had for a time acquired almost the appearance of a German town, has now a thoroughly Slavic character. The National literature also, which had almost ceased to exist, is in a very flourishing state, particularly since the founding of a National university. At no period have so many and so valuable books been written in the Bohemian language.

Count Lützow himself had an English mother and German father, but has identified himself completely with the Bohemian Nationalism. The Countess is the daughter of a German minister in Mecklenburg, but feels such antipathy for the Germans that, not knowing the Bohemian language, she speaks only English and French.

About fifty years ago, several Bohemian writers were bold enough to write in their own language instead of German; from that time the Bohemian spirit has grown until now hostility to the German language has become a passion. In many of the restaurants throughout Bohemia, the headwaiter passes a collection-box regularly for "the Mother of Schools," which supports public schools in the Bohemian language in all parts of the country where there is a majority of Germans—only German schools being provided by the Government in such communities. The inevitable result of this national spirit is the gradual elimination of the German language. One rarely hears German on the streets of Prague, whereas ten years ago one heard little else. Fathers who were brought up to speak German teach their children to speak Bohemian. Business men take the great-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est pride in succeeding without knowing German, for it proves that Bohemia is developing ability to stand alone. Most older people know both languages equally well, but the younger know little German. At the University of Prague the Bohemian graduates do not know German well, and the Bohemian part of the university is more than twice as large as the German. The nationalizing process of unifying the people is going on in the face of the disrupting force of eleven political parties and the sharp spiritual division into Catholics and anti-Catholics.

It has unquestionably been a disadvantage for a people of seven millions to cut itself off from the opportunities of the environing German culture, science, and commerce, but even those who have seen this most clearly have deliberately made the sacrifice in their struggle for the freedom of the spirit. When we remember that the prestige is on the side of the Germans, we realize in this movement the same indifference to personal success that characterizes the religious enthusiast.

Bohemian Nationalism is strong also in America, expressing itself most strongly in organized propaganda for free thought. This is an interesting story in itself; it is mentioned because primarily it is an expression of the historical hatred of Catholic Austria, just as Polish Catholicism is an opposition to Orthodox Russia and Protestant Prussia, and Irish Catholicism to Protestant England. As the sight of a Russian church makes a Pole pious, so the sight of any church intensifies Bohemian free-thinking. In the city of Chicago alone there are twenty-seven thousand Bohemians who make quarterly payments for the support of schools on Saturday and Sunday for the teaching of the Bohemian language and free-thought.

The most inclusive form of Slavic Nationalism is pan-Slavism. An enormous stride toward its crystallization was made by the international Slavic gymnastic meet in Prague in 1912. More than twenty thousand persons took part; at one time eleven thousand men speaking many different languages and including the soon-to-be enemies, Bulgarians and Servians, were doing calisthenic exercises together. The Poles would not come because the Russians were invited, but all the other Slavic divisions were represented: Slovaks, Slovenes, Serbs, Servians, Croatians, Bulgarians, Montenegrins, Ruthenians, Moravians, Bohemians, and Russians.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Slavie! Slavie!*" was the key-note of every speech, and every utterance aroused the wildest enthusiasm. The meet was held at the same time that the Olympic games were taking place at Stockholm. The latter aroused the greatest international interest, but the meet at Prague which was fanning the sparks which were to set Europe aflame with war passed almost unnoticed by all but Slavs. A quarter of a million visitors filled the city and illustrated reports of the exhibition went to the ends of the Slavic world. A few weeks afterward I saw some pasted on the wall of a peasant factory in the back districts of Moscow. The German papers of Prague were full of the Stockholm games, but completely ignored the meet in their own city, which no self-respecting German could attend. The streets were everywhere brilliant with flags, but never the Austrian flag.

During the Balkan War, for Austria to threaten Servia was like rushing to destruction, for it was bound to arouse a Slavic revolt. When Bohemians were being entrained from their garrisons for mobilization on the Servian border, they sang the pan-Slavic hymn, "*Hej Slovane,*" sung by all Slavic nations, but forbidden to Austrian soldiers in service. This is an enthusiastic and powerful hymn, full of encouragement to the Slavs, telling them that their language shall never perish, nor shall they, "even though the number of Germans equal the number of souls in hell." It is estimated that more than seventy thousand young men disappeared from Austria when they were called for their military service; there is every reason to believe that in the present war also the heart of the Austrian Slav is on the other side.

Poland, perhaps, offers the most highly developed example of Nationalism. It was never a conspicuous country, but over a hundred years ago it was free. Germany, Austria, and Russia divided it, and, completely ignoring sociological laws, have tried to absorb it. Never was there another so persistent and deliberate effort to wipe out national individuality, but if there ever was a case of imperial indigestion, Poland has caused three chronic attacks. Bismarck's foolish policy of forbidding the Polish language and forcing German in its place, and Russia's similar policy with Russian, can be called a basic cause for the present European turmoil, because it has made the preservation of language a religion, and martyrdom for it a glorification. The Poles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think that their love for the church is piety, while in reality they are good Catholics because their religion is Poland, and Catholicism is a Polish protest against Orthodox Russia and Protestant Prussia. I was interested to observe that a Polish gentleman, whose education would have made him a weak Catholic in any other country, after passing a Russian church would always cross himself more fervidly when passing the next Catholic church. Every sign of Russia or Germany says to a Pole "Be a good Catholic." In fact, any particular religious form is never so strong as the spirit of Nationalism to which it may often serve merely as a symbol. The obsession of the Poles is to find some way to thwart the plans of the various controlling governments. Progress as a policy has no interest for them. Pan-Slavism has not as yet become a motive to them, partly because their hatred of the Russians has hitherto precluded any suggestion of a union with them. Since they are the most numerous Slavs, except the Russians, numbering about forty millions, and the most aggressively nationalistic, they have been one of the chief causes of the heavy armaments of both Germany and Russia. If the promise of Russia to grant autonomy to the Poles in return for their loyalty is made in good faith, she has under the compulsion of necessity taken a step which sound sense should have dictated long ago. It is difficult to imagine the change of front which will occur among the Poles in consequence. Unquestionably its influence on the Pan-Slavic union will be exceedingly great.

Lithuania and Finland show the same phenomenon of growing national spirit as Bohemia and Poland. In their cases, however, the revolt is against the cultural authority of a group who are not their political rulers, instead of being both political and cultural. The Lithuanian movement is going on within Poland. Several centuries ago the two countries were united by the marriage of rulers, the Government and culture of Lithuania becoming Polish. The Lithuanian language was preserved by the peasants as in Bohemia. Poles and Germans were the landholders; the Lithuanians were the laborers and serfs. Within the last decade the Lithuanian consciousness has burst into a conflagration. A man fully Polish in culture and association, but possessing Lithuanian blood, becomes Lithuanian in spirit. He learns the language from the peasants and chooses them for associates rather than the cultured Poles whom he would have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sought ten years ago. After the revolution in 1905 in the gymnasia, the privilegè was granted to students of adopting the Russian, Polish, or Lithuanian language for part of their instruction where previously only Russian had been allowed. In a gymnasium in Vilna ten years ago three out of thirty chose Lithuanian; now out of he same number at least twenty take Lithuanian. This change is an indication of the growth of the movement among the people. I have had two Lithuanian students who speak Polish as a mother tongue and Lithuanian with relative difficulty. One is half Polish in blood, and has learned to read Lithuanian since coming to this country. When attending the gymnasium in 1905 he chose Polish as his language; his younger brother now in the gymnasium speaks nothing but Lithuanian when possible, though his mother does not know the language at all, and his father only slightly. A still older brother, a successful attorney in St. Petersburg, is now studying the language and feels fully Lithuanian.

For six and a half centuries the Finns were ruled by Sweden. In 1809 their country became subject to Russia. Their culture has been continuously Swedish. At the University of Helsingfors, where twenty-five years ago all the work was done in Swedish, now a larger part is in Finnish, and the Finnish spirit is increasing by leaps and bounds. Seven and a half centuries of Swedish culture with no Finnish education has had no effect, except to stimulate the growth of Finnish national feeling. The people live amicably together. The government has been increasingly Russian, but there are absolutely no signs of assimilation. Helsingfors and the other Finnish cities look more like Detroit or Washington than like St. Petersburg, though Russian influence has been working a full century on them.

Illustrations of the development of national spirit among the warring people and others might be greatly multiplied. Enough have been given to show that the conflict in Europe is not simple, but is the product of complex social psychology, and that, whatever the outcome of the war, these forces will continue to work until their demands are satisfied. Organized Pan-Slavism is no more to be desired than organized Pan-Germanism, but group freedom is essential to the human soul and must come. The dream of pan-Slavism is a potential fact in the struggle to attain this freedom. This social law which underlies the war in Europe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be learned as a result of the present gigantic conflict or peace will not be assured.

The precipitation of the war was due to the fact that the highly organized nations of Europe were so superlatively prepared for war that they were in a state of unstable equilibrium which could no longer stand the tension. This war should silence for ever the old dogma that the way to preserve peace is to be prepared for war. This war, which is an apparent travesty on civilization, is probably a prelude to ultimate international peace, since the time necessary for physical recovery will be great enough to give opportunity for the adoption of obvious sociological principles which could make no headway against the political medievalism of the immediate past.

HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRACTICAL MEDIATION AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

BY CHARLES H. SHERRILL

At this crisis in the world's history, there is a crying need for some practical plan to further the somewhat disheartened crusade for international peace. But it must be practical, demonstrably and convincingly practical, because a general impression has gotten abroad that peace societies are impractical—probably because their efforts have come to be handicapped by certain impractical folk whose stock in trade is talk and whose motives are tainted by a fondness for seeing their names in print. Besides, notwithstanding their efforts, wars seem to increase in frequency rather than to disappear. This article is written to point out that a peace plan of the most practical nature has been both initiated and matured on our side of the ocean, a plan that has succeeded in averting a war, whilst in the Old World a whole continent is plunged into a dreadful maelstrom of armed strife from which it will take years to recover. This plan is what is generally known as the A-B-C mediation—the friendly offer by Argentina, Brazil, and Chile of their good offices in the difficult situation which arose between our country and Mexico, growing out of internecine strife in the latter's territory.

The two most outstanding results of this mediation in the Mexican crisis are, first, that a High Court of Public Opinion has been established for the Western Hemisphere and, second, that the Monroe Doctrine has suddenly become continental and is no longer, even in the opinion of Latin-America, unilateral and constabulary.

For the first time in the political life of the New World we have seen appear a High Court of Public Opinion, appealing so equally to Latin-Americans and Anglo-Saxon Americans as to secure for its conclusions a respectful ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceptance both in North and South America, an acceptance far harder for any one country to disregard than even the formal decisions of the Hague Tribunal. Indeed, in many ways it is the most practical result of that praiseworthy machinery for international peace which the successive meetings at The Hague devised and fostered. We call it a High Court of Public Opinion; and why not?—who will gainsay such a title? Did it not consider in formal, patient, and decorous fashion the various sides of a vexed question, and was not the result of its effort the averting of a war,—a war wholly unnecessary and yet, save for this mediation, dangerously imminent because affronts to national dignity were in the air, affronts which no nation could brook?

A court must be respected to be influential, and of international courts this is especially true, lacking as they do the police powers enjoyed by a court whose jurisdiction is limited to its own nationals. A court must have gained the indorsement of public opinion to be really effective, and the one we are discussing is a tribunal which possessed that indorsement for the excellent reason that it was the product of that very public opinion.

If the public opinion of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile had not already been educated up to approving this offer of mediation, it would never have been made, but, thus approved, it carried with it so great a prestige as to insure the acceptance of the mediators' conclusions by Mexico, another Latin-American country, an acceptance which nothing fathered by an Anglo-Saxon country could have achieved. It will take a little time for the people of the United States to realize how powerful an agency for international good such a tribunal as this possesses in the Western Hemisphere, because we as a people do not yet know how much more powerful is public opinion in South America than among us.

That it is so powerful is due to several reasons. One of them—and a most important reason—was sensed by Henry Clay when, during his campaign in Congress for the recognition of the independence of the struggling Spanish Colonies, he pointed out the amazing excellence of their Press—more and better newspapers, said he, being then published in Buenos Aires than in all of Spain and Portugal. Those high journalistic traditions have been worthily maintained, and it is difficult to overestimate the educational influence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of good newspapers upon the public opinion of people so devoted to their perusal as are the South Americans.

In view of our ignorance upon this point, it is necessary to emphasize how much more the leading journals of that Continent turn the attention of their readers to international affairs than do ours. One of them, the *Prensa,* of Buenos Aires, with its daily two whole pages of cabled news sets a standard which none of our papers has yet reached. This amount of foreign news spread daily under the eyes of the South American, sets him a-thinking on international subjects, and keeps him thinking thereon day by day. It is no wonder, then, that the average man among them is more given to considering foreign affairs than are men of the same type among us.

Nor is it by newspaper-reading alone that our friends to the south of us have become so generally enlightened upon international questions as to be able to produce so sensible, so practical a solution of a difficult problem affecting two nations as this mediation has proved to be. Their great universities have long devoted more attention to international law than have ours, and have interested in that subject many leaders of their bar, men of the type which in our country would be drawn rather to advising upon large internal affairs. By reason of the popularizing by South-American universities of international law as a study, their educated men come to the task of treating a concrete case involving two or more nations much better equipped than we do. This should not surprise us, because such questions have for years enjoyed the attention of a greater proportion of their leaders in thought than has been the case in the United States.

In this regard let me speak a word concerning the University of Buenos Aires with its five thousand students, for my two years' residence in that city better qualifies me to speak of it than of any other of the many distinguished seats of learning on that Continent. It is astonishing to foreigners to learn how long is the line of famous international lawyers trained by the Law Department of that University. Two of them, Calvo and Drago, lend their names to two well-known doctrines of that great science, but there are many others—Merou, Zeballos, Montes de Oca, Pinero, etc.

Not only is South-American manhood far better equipped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for treating international problems than is generally realized in the United States, but also their manhood possesses a mental vigor about which we are but illy informed. We generally think of them as tropical races, handicapped by a tropical climate—that is a mistake. We have for so many years been accustomed to regard them from afar off—to study them through a telescope whose nearer lens was overadorned with tropical vegetation, that we have either forgotten or never known that much of their portion of the hemisphere lies either in a temperate zone or else so high above sea-level (Quito, Ecuador, is 10,000 feet up; Mexico City 7,500 feet, etc.) as to enjoy a temperate climate.

Let me give one example of their manhood from many that I know:—there is a gentleman in Buenos Aires who is not only a leading member of Congress, but at the same time conducts a large law practice, is an active member of the Law Faculty of the University, and is editor of a law review which has a wide circulation abroad as well as at home. Nor is the wide range of his activities regarded as in any way unusual in that community! To one who likes these people, and who knows the education which they have long been receiving from their universities and their Press, it is not difficult to understand either that such a practical step as the A-B-C mediation should have been evolved by them or that the corollary is true, viz., that the utmost public respect would be accorded throughout Latin-America to a tribunal erected in such a manner.

And now as a preface to speaking of the second great result of this A-B-C mediation, and also as a constant reader of that South-American Press whose influence we have seen is so great, that it has been both delightful and significant to note the wide appreciation by those journals of our action in accepting this proffered mediation and in waiving any indemnity for the military occupation of Vera Cruz which circumstances forced upon us. This appreciation is delightful because it shows a changed attitude of Latin-American public opinion toward us, and it is significant because it indicates a brotherly tendency to understand the altruistic undercurrent of our national spirit. Our hearty acceptance of the mediation has done more to convince South America of our total lack of any desire to annex territory than did our successive withdrawals from Cuba after intervention there. They are more convinced now of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the integrity of our purposes than even they were by two other recent and splendid proofs thereof, viz., our defense of Venezuelan territory in 1895, and our action in being the only nation to return to China a large portion of the Boxer indemnity.

And now for this second great result of the A-B-C mediation, which is nothing more or less than the assumption by South America of her share in the responsibilities and development of the Monroe Doctrine. In that regard surely no development more important than this mediation has taken place since President Monroe sent his famous message to Congress on December 2, 1823! At last South America realizes the altruism of our point of view in regard to that essential feature of our foreign policy, and at last our people have come to appreciate the immense practical value of South-American public opinion in questions affecting the welfare of nations in our hemisphere.

And how else than by means of this mediation could this splendid two-sided realization have come to pass so promptly? It is nearly five years now since the importance of joint action by Pan-American countries in settling Pan-American difficulties began to be discussed in Buenos Aires. The idea was well received there, particularly by its ablest journalists, and it was especially clear in the remarkable mind of Dr. Davila, the talented editor of *La Prensa*. To talk at any length with him was to be converted to the crusade for the idea, and it was my privilege later to urge some such joint action to nearly two hundred commercial bodies all over our country. A most inspiring ideal it was, but what a long and weary struggle seemed ahead before the consummation "so devoutly to be wished"!

And now it has swiftly come true, a beautiful and splendid fact, a precedent to be followed, a standard set up which shall restrain any but forward steps in the future!

It is hard to say which was the more difficult to effect—to convince South America that the Monroe Doctrine did not mean territorial acquisition by us, or to overcome the ignorance in our country of what South America really is. But both these seemingly unattainable results have been achieved, and by this one act of South-American mediation, offered in a spirit of practical international arbitration, and accepted in an equally admirable spirit of national good faith.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Too high praise cannot be given to the diplomatic representatives at Washington of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—Dr. Naon, Dr. da Gama, and Dr. Suarez—for their admirable part in this mediation, so admirable as to excite the highest encomiums on every side and to gain for them justly merited action by our Congress and recognition by our universities.

There is perhaps limit beyond which, however, such a mediation could serve no useful purpose. It is true that this mediation has given great impulsion to the doctrine of the complete sovereignty of each nation, be it large or small, something which hitherto Latin-Americans have unreasoningly believed to be threatened by the Monroe Doctrine, but it is equally true that at the present development of international relations there should be a limit set to such proffers of mediation. Certain questions are so interwoven into the warp and woof of a nation's sovereignty—are believed to be so vital to its well-being and safety—as to make a real danger to its sovereignty of any offer of mediation therein by neutral Powers. Take, for example, the question of the jurisdiction of the River Plate, a matter so vital to both the nations bordering it, and at the same time so delicate as to make outside intermeddling both unwise and unpractical. On our side of the ocean we have taken a long stride forward toward finding a reliable safeguard for international peace, so long a stride and so practical a one that it would be a pity if further advances should be imperiled by unpractical suggestions from quarters not so well equipped in matters international as our South-American friends have just proved themselves to be.

The millennium is not here yet, and we should at present content ourselves with seeking only such steps to adjust or arbitrate international misunderstandings as are incontestably practical. Let us be practical, as practical as the South Americans have shown themselves to be by their A-B-C mediation offer.

CHARLES H. SHERRILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECENT ELECTIONS AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BY IDA HUSTED HARPER

When four States conferred the complete franchise on women between 1890 and 1896—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho—the opponents became alarmed and for the next fourteen years in only three States—South Dakota, Oregon, and Washington—could Legislatures be persuaded to submit the question to the voters, and in all it was defeated. The country politically was entirely under the domination of forces hostile to reforms of all kinds, as Congress and Legislatures were largely controlled by three powers working in unison—the "trusts," the liquor interests, and the party "machines." Five or six years ago the more progressive elements among legislators and the people at large reached the limit of endurance and an insurgent movement began to develop. One of its earliest expressions was the initiative and referendum law, transferring a part of the authority of the Legislature to the voters, and its effect on Congress was seen in the elimination to a great degree of the reactionary powers that so long had dominated that body.

Among the first fruits of this improved condition was the revival of interest in woman suffrage, and the submission of a constitutional amendment in the State of Washington in 1910, its adoption by every county, and the vote in Seattle of three to one were the direct result of this new insurgent spirit in politics. This was equally true of California in 1911, the Legislature which submitted it being composed of these progressive elements, and the strenuously fought-for victory was due to this spirit in the leaders and the majority of the electors. They had taken their stand on high ground and believed they could not hold it without the political help

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of women. Suffragists in various parts of the country took courage from the situation which enabled them in 1912 to carry their case to the voters in six States—Ohio by action of a constitutional convention; Michigan, Wisconsin, and Kansas by that of Legislatures. In Oregon and Arizona the Legislatures, knowing it would be successful, refused to submit an amendment, and the women, turning to the initiative and referendum law, secured the necessary number of petitions. How little the Legislatures represented the people was shown at the election, when the amendment was carried in every county in Arizona and received a majority of 4,500 in Oregon. It was adopted in Kansas by over 16,000 votes, carrying 74 out of 104 counties, and Topeka, Wichita, and Kansas City.

In Ohio and Wisconsin it was overwhelmingly defeated by a combination of opposing forces against which no amendment for any purpose could have succeeded, but in Ohio it received about a quarter of a million votes, the largest number ever recorded in any State for woman suffrage. In Michigan it was supposed for several weeks to have been carried, and then was declared lost by a few hundred votes. The Legislature submitted it again and in the spring of 1913 it was defeated by a big majority which the suffragists have never been able to understand. That year the new Legislature of Alaska Territory conferred the full franchise on women, which Congress had given it power to do. The Legislature of Illinois, by a provision of its constitution, gave to women a vote on all measures submitted to the electors and for all offices not provided for in that instrument. These comprised Presidential electors; all municipal, village, and township officers except police magistrates, and included judges and clerks of city courts; county collector and surveyor; members of county boards of assessors and of review and the State board of equalization; clerk of the appellate court and sanitary district trustees.

The end of 1913 found women fully enfranchised in nine States and one Territory, and with a large measure of suffrage in Illinois. Favorable public sentiment had vastly increased; the movement had spread over the country until every State had its organizations; hundreds of thousands of people had signed petitions and membership cards; associations representing many millions of members had officially indorsed it; thousands of women were actively work-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing for the suffrage where there had been ten a few years before; it had, in fact, become a national issue. Experienced leaders, who know the cost of a campaign in time, strength, and money, were almost appalled at the beginning of 1914, when they faced the prospect of campaigns in seven States —Nevada, Montana, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri, and Ohio. In the first four the question of submission had passed both branches of the Legislature by large majorities; in Nevada it had been adopted by two Legislatures. That of Nebraska had for years refused to submit it; it had not been considered worth while even to ask that of Ohio; in Missouri it passed both Houses by a large vote, but as soon as the members heard from St. Louis they reconsidered and defeated it. In those three States, therefore, the women were obliged to resort to initiative petitions in order to get their case before the electors, who alone could decide it.

It is not an easy or a pleasant task for women to tramp over a State in the winter and early spring, interviewing men of all classes and conditions, and asking a favor of them —voting by comparison would be a very private and exclusive function. In Missouri the initiative law forbids any paid canvassers, and the work here, as in all the States, was a labor of love by mothers, grandmothers, college girls, and self-supporting women. Thousands more than the required 23,000 names of voters were presented to the Secretary of State in the presence of the Governor. It is especially difficult to secure petitions under the initiative law of Nebraska, but the women collected 36,000 names, many more than were needed. In Ohio 104,000 were required, representing at least one-half the counties; they obtained 131,300, representing every county. In these three States all of this work and all that followed in the succeeding strenuous months will have to be done again.

At the time of writing the official returns of the vote on the suffrage amendment have not been received from any State, but it is known that it was carried in only two—Nevada and Montana—in the latter it is believed by over 4,000, in the former by a safe majority. In each of the seven States their own women made a splendid campaign and expected to win, but national leaders of experience hardly hoped to carry more than three, and when the full strength of the opposition was shown toward the close they would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not have been surprised if all had been lost. A superficial observer going through those States during the summer and autumn months would have felt sure that the amendment would succeed. Practically all organizations of men and women declared for it with great enthusiasm, the Federations of Labor, Grand Army of the Republic, Teachers' Associations, Granges and Farmers' Alliances, the Progressive, Socialist, and Prohibition parties, and in some States the Democratic and Republican; religious bodies of all denominations. In every possible way that women themselves could speak they gave official indorsement through the Federations of Clubs, Woman's Relief Corps, College Women's Clubs, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Councils of Women, Colored Women's Association, Women's Trade Unions, Graduate Nurses' Association, and many other organizations. In not one State had the men any ground for saying, "The women do not want it." In some counties from eighty to eighty-five per cent. of them signed petitions for it; in Ohio more than half a million women asked for it. There were parades of from 5,000 to 7,000 women in various cities, with hundreds of thousands of cheering spectators.

Halls were not large enough to hold the audiences. Men would leave their own political street meetings and flock to those of the suffragists. Public men seemed to have no fear, and United States Senators, Governors, Mayors, and other officials spoke at the suffrage meetings and banquets. Secretary of State Bryan and other prominent men made eloquent suffrage speeches in Nebraska. Speaker Champ Clark championed it in Missouri. The rules of the Merchant's Exchange in St. Louis were suspended in order that Miss Jane Addams might make a suffrage speech there, and the City Club of business men gave a luncheon for Dr. Anna Shaw, president of the National Suffrage Association, while at the big Democratic rally in Joplin addressed by Mr. Bryan the county committee voted unanimously to grant a suffrage speaker ten minutes of the time. And yet Nebraska and Missouri gave large majorities against the amendment!

In each of the seven States the suffragists made a clean, dignified, honest, and honorable campaign, with no hint of intrigue or bargaining, and it is not likely that their worst enemies would make such a charge against them. In Ne-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vada their campaign lasted three years; in the other States from one to two years; and almost universally they worked without financial recompense. They earned a large part of the campaign expenses by suppers, fairs, lectures, selling papers, and various devices. At least ninety-nine hundredths of their funds were contributed by women. No man in the United States has lifted a finger to earn the franchise for himself. It may be said that his ancestors did, but they earned it for their women descendants as well. If the men of this country had a correct sense of responsibility and moral obligation they would relieve women at once and for ever of all further effort to obtain the franchise and take the burden entirely on themselves.

After there were enough returns from the recent elections to show defeat in five States newspaper editorials in all parts of the country urged the women not to be tempted into any form of "militantism" and to remember that the suffrage must be won by education and enlightenment. The reader would suppose that was the way men had won their suffrage—the negroes and the Indians, for instance, or, to take a more recent case, the Filipinos and the Porto-Ricans! The amendment was not defeated in any of those five States because the men lacked education and enlightenment on the question—far from it. Women have conducted between thirty and forty of these State campaigns, have given to them their very hearts' blood for three generations; they expect to struggle through many more and not take up the torch or the hatchet, but they do intend by legitimate means to make life miserable for members of Congress until they obtain the submission of a national amendment which will relieve them from the most cruel and unequal contest that ever was waged. There are arrayed against woman suffrage all the reactionary and vicious forces in the country, all of them enfranchised and unlimited as to finances. It is the only reform movement in existence whose strongest supporters cannot cast a vote in its favor, and the only one that could ever make a gain with this handicap and the opposition of the still controlling forces in American politics.

The employers of labor are determined that no more political power shall be placed in the hands of working people; those corporations that thrive by corrupting legislative bodies are exceedingly adverse to a new class of voters; the party "machines" dread nothing so much as an electorate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of women, and more aggressive, determined, and dangerous than all of these combined are the liquor interests with their endless ramifications extending to the remotest corners, touching innumerable kinds of legitimate business, and directly connected with every form of vice that demoralizes society. These interests never faced such an avalanche of hostile public sentiment as at the present time, which is finding expression in the Legislatures and at the polls, and is nearer than ever before to the doors of Congress, and they believe that if women were a factor in politics the opposition would be a hundredfold strengthened. They always have been the deadly secret foe of woman suffrage, but this year in the campaign States they fought it openly in the newspapers, on the bill-boards, in street-car placards, and with all the vast resources at their command. This alone would have been sufficient to defeat it, but their efforts were supplemented by a very large class of men who are not connected with them, but fear that women as voters would secure " blue laws " of various kinds to interfere with their liberties. Women have not brought about drastic legislation where they have the ballot, but they have done enough cleaning up to make some men apprehensive.

The leaders of the woman-suffrage movement have always tried to keep it entirely separate from that for prohibition, and in order to prove that the two were not identical they have pointed to the fact that no State where women were enfranchised had adopted prohibition. At the recent election prohibition amendments were submitted in six States and carried by large majorities in four, in all of which women vote—Washington, Oregon, Colorado, and Arizona. The one in California probably would have been adopted had it not been so radical that even the clergymen advised voting against it. Ohio snowed it under along with woman suffrage. This was the only State where both amendments were pending, and it proved what has often been demonstrated, that not all men who are for temperance measures are for woman suffrage. Doubtless without the desire of the advocates of either measure the two will henceforth run closely together, and some votes will thus be alienated from the one for suffrage, but the hostility of the liquor interests could not be any more intensified even if they were one and the same.

This new complication threatens to array against woman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffrage one class of its strongest supporters, as various labor organizations are taking strong ground against prohibition; and yet it is said the amendment was carried in Montana partly as a protest of the working people against the absolute domination of the liquor interests over all legislation. These interests fought it in Nevada as tenaciously as they would in New York, but with a predominance of 200 men of voting age to 100 women the men decided to take the chance. There is no State that will profit more in proportion, as, while there are 40,000 men over twenty-one and only 18,000 women, fully half of the men are transient and "floating," not staying in the State or in one place long enough to vote, while the women are permanent and for the most part wives and mothers deeply interested in the welfare of their community.

The winning of these two States extends woman suffrage over one-third of the area of the country and excludes the western section from further contest. It also adds four United States Senators to those who will vote for a national suffrage amendment. The work of a campaign is not lost, as people generally stay "converted" and the women learn a great deal by experience. Doubtless all the defeated States will at once begin to prepare for another campaign, and to these will be added several more within the next year. Resolutions for submitting amendments to the voters have passed one Legislature in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Iowa, and will be acted on by a second this coming winter, while in many States it has to pass only one. The reactionary tendencies of the recent election indicate the elimination of a third party strong enough to hold the balance of power against the two old parties, which would be detrimental to the success of woman suffrage, but it is now a live political issue and such it will remain as long as any State in the Union refuses to enfranchise its women.

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED

BY WILLIAM PARR CAPES

THE nation-wide discussion about our army of unemployed and the remedial measures proposed in behalf of the idle, have, within the last few months, brought us nearer the solution of this time-worn problem than we in this country have ever been before. Most of the arguments and proposals have been enlightening and constructive. They have overshadowed the dogmatism of the advocates of destructive theories. Instead of substantiating the belief held by those of ultra-radical views, that we are approaching chaotic social, industrial, and economic conditions which are growing worse every day, the agitation has been a most compelling and salutary force. It has simply laid bare a situation that has existed for some time, and by doing so has at last forced upon the public the conviction, held and espoused heretofore only by those who had carefully studied the extent and causes of idleness, that every city at all times has an unemployment problem in urgent need of our best thought and effort. It has made a dilatory nation and many procrastinating States conscious of the need of constructive legislative action. It, too, has brought to public attention facts which show that, although we have for a long time been discussing in a more or less indifferent way the subject of unemployment and allied economic shortcomings, we have failed to make necessary elementary studies to enable us to eliminate the unfit, to care for them and, when possible, to rehabilitate them. We are also becoming conscious of many inconsistencies and of some inhuman methods in our present effort to care for those out of work and to connect the "jobless man with the manless job."

If, as some contend, the size of the idle army that last winter besieged public and private relief agencies was only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

normal and not the result of abnormal industrial and commercial conditions, their statements simply add to the proof of our negligence and accentuate the necessity for constructive work. Except for political purposes mainly it is a waste of time to argue the question as to the abnormality of prevailing conditions in the labor market. The fact that in New York and the other large cities of the country there have been thousands of men out of work and in need of food and shelter is sufficient to establish the existence of an annual problem and to justify serious consideration and immediate action by the nation, States, and municipalities.

And within the last twelve months more consideration has been given to the needs of the men out of work by more individuals and organizations, and more has been accomplished in the way of making basic studies and providing remedial measures than within a similar period in some time. For this we may thank those who brought the conditions to public attention by their declarations, either sincerely made or for political effect, that the number of unemployed has been abnormal. Whatever may have been the underlying cause for the discussion, and however justifiable may have been the claims of those responsible for it, we have made some progress toward a solution.

In the recent discussion by public officials, individual philanthropists, and organizations, there has been a strong tendency to advocate and to demand something more than a temporary substitute for work for the idle. This clearly indicates that the public is beginning to appreciate the fallacy of bringing about permanent improvement by relying upon palliative measures, such as bread lines, soup kitchens, and other means of temporarily lessening distress. This changed public attitude is an encouraging sign of progress. But more than this, important as it is, has been accomplished. The National Government has recognized the problem and the number of States that have provided Labor Bureaus has increased. Far more important, however, than all of these has been the desire of public officials, especially those in municipalities, to obtain basic facts for use in the construction of a more efficient service, to the end that the employable among applicants for municipal aid may be enabled to rehabilitate themselves and all others wisely and adequately provided for. As New York City, the greatest of social laboratories, provides unequaled facilities for making a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study of this character, the Department of Charities of that city, supported by several private social-service agencies, took the leadership, and during the first three months of the year made a comprehensive inquiry into the physical, mental, and social history of 1,483 homeless men who applied for aid at the Municipal Lodging House. As a result of this study New York now has most valuable data to guide its officials in formulating a constructive plan to help and to care for its homeless dependents.

In any helpful discussion or study of poverty or of the unemployment problem we must first grant the necessity for dividing the idle into two classes, the homeless single men and women and those with a family to support. Unless this division is made and each group is studied separately, we are liable to set up inaccurate hypotheses which will lead into all kinds of complexities and absurdities. What we may find necessary to do for the homeless idle as a result of our study of that class may not impress us as at all urgent for the betterment of the unemployed breadwinner, and *vice versa.*

Although the same causes of poverty will be found among the homeless and the breadwinners of families, the relative importance of many of these causes in each class is different. We find this same difficulty in our search for the causes of unemployment. In the report of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor for 1913 we find that sickness and injuries were the chief causes assigned for the dependency in forty-two per cent. of the 6,060 families in that organization's care that year. Intemperance was assigned as the chief immediate cause for the destitution of only five per cent. of these families. The report says that facts disclosed by more intensive studies would seem to indicate that these figures are too low. No doubt a more accurate statement would be that from sixty to seventy-five per cent. of the families are dragged into dependency by sickness, and from ten to fifteen per cent. by intemperance. The recent inquiry made by the New York Department of Charities into the cause of the dependency of the 1,483 homeless men examined shows that the poverty of twelve and three-tenths per cent. resulted from permanent physical incapacity, such as old age, tuberculosis, eye, ear, and heart trouble, accident, epilepsy, and venereal disease. Nine per cent. were physically incapacitated temporarily, and another six per cent. were mentally incapacitated. Vagrancy and intemperance were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responsible for eighteen per cent. of the dependents, while in twenty-nine per cent. industrial and moral factors were so inextricably combined that it was impossible to ascribe the downfall of the individual to either one alone. Termination, irregularity, or unfavorable conditions of their employment, forced one-fourth of these applicants to ask the city for temporary help. Although allowance must be made for the personal equation which enters strongly into any effort to determine the causes of dependency in a group of individuals or families, the startling differences in percentages for the same causes in these two classes strongly indicates that we should not use the same hypotheses in our efforts to solve the problem of unemployment among breadwinners of families and among homeless men. Before we can determine the most practical and effective methods of attack we must study each group separately.

Because of the well-organized and scientific work among dependent families and because the workers in this field become intimately acquainted with the needy families and continue their interest in them for some time, we have fairly accurate and comprehensive information about the character and ability of the unemployed in this class. For example, the Bureau of Relief and Rehabilitation of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor had, during January of this year, 208 men with families apply for employment. This was the first time any of these men had sought the aid of that agency. Of these unemployed the Superintendent of the Bureau says fifty-eight were obviously unemployable, that is, they were either unwilling or unfitted to keep a job for any length of time; at least five were mentally defective, seven were too old to work, three were evidently unwilling to work, and forty-three were handicapped physically. The remaining 150 men, however, were able-bodied and anxious to secure employment. The average income of each person during the last year had been $425, and each had worked on an average of eight and a half months. Except for the facts secured as a result of the recent study made by the New York Charities Department, we have practically no reliable information like this about the homeless men, especially those who seek municipal aid. Two reasons are responsible for this deficiency in information: (1) transitory contact with almost all of the applicants has made it difficult to make the necessary studies, and (2) the average taxpayer still looks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

askance at the expense of research work that has as its ultimate purpose prevention. The demand by the public for quick returns and immediate benefits by municipal administration has not yet been overcome by far-sighted policies which call for immediate investment and yield future benefits.

One of the first important steps, then, in the solution of the unemployed problem should, in any State and municipality, be a thorough and comprehensive study of the character and capability of the homeless men and women who apply for relief. After these facts have been obtained, collated, and studied, and after these statistics compiled by agencies dealing with dependent families have been gathered, we shall have some basis upon which to estimate the number of homeless applicants who are unemployable because of old age or other handicaps, the number of those who have legal residence in other localities and friends or relatives able to assist them with homes or work, the number of tramps, vagrants, inebriates, and beggars, and the number of those who are aliens and should be returned by the Commissioner of Immigration as public dependents, in accordance with the law. With these facts in our possession we shall know how much and what kind of work we must do. We shall also realize the senselessness and injustice of some of the methods that our present laws, if enforced strictly, would compel us to adopt. We, too, shall be able to arouse public sentiment, now dormant, in favor of adequate and proper State and municipal care for those unfit and unfitted to work. And when these changes in law have been made and these needs provided by State and municipality, we shall discover that the solution of the remainder of the problem—to find work for the employable—will not be so large and so complex.

New York City, where millions of dollars are spent annually to relieve the distress resulting from poverty, and the great Empire State, of which it is a part, furnish as startling examples of inhuman and unjust methods of dealing with homeless dependents and of legislative procrastination in providing adequate care for these unemployables as can be found anywhere. A strict enforcement of Paragraph Five, Chapter 535 of the Laws of 1886 and of Section 662 of the Charter of New York City would quickly arouse a demand for a readjustment of legal procedure and of State policy in dealing with the homeless man. The law requires the New

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York City Commissioner of Charities to refuse free food and lodging to any person who applies for aid at the Municipal Lodging House more than three times in any month. It also provides that if any person shall refuse to perform such labor as is specified by the Commissioner and suited to the applicant's age, strength, and capacity, he shall be deemed a vagrant and may be prosecuted and punished. It is only fair to assume that the persons who drafted and enacted the laws containing these provisions acted on the assumption that the State and city would provide adequate care and proper treatment for those to whom it denied help. But the failure of both to make these provisions has brought on a situation that now is acute, distressing, and unjust.

If the laws had been strictly enforced in New York City last winter many homeless men, capable and willing to work, would have been sent to the workhouse as vagrants, simply because they could not find a manless job. The recent study indicates that at least one-fourth of the applicants were employable at the time they sought aid. Others would have been punished in a similar way because they were unfitted to work, some through no fault of their own, and others owing to improvidence. Still others who are unfit but capable of being restored to partial self-support would have been sent to this supposedly correctional institution, which at the present time provides no proper treatment and training to improve their condition. The remainder, those incapacitated beyond hope of even partial rehabilitation, have been allowed to drift or to become burdens upon private relief organizations, because the municipal institutions to which they should have been sent have been overcrowded. Thus we find in the New York situation, which is probably as acute at all times as that in any other part of the country, the necessity for a thorough study of the homeless applicant for municipal aid so that employables may be separated from the unfit and unfitted.

Both the State and City of New York, after years of procrastination, have made a feeble beginning to provide institutions to which the greater part of unemployables may be sent for rehabilitative treatment. During the first year of the Dix administration the State authorized the establishment of a State Farm Colony for Tramps and Vagrants. In January, 1913, it took title to 825 acres of land as a site for the institution, but unfortunately no provision was made for the development of the colony, hence the project at the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time is practically at a standstill. With an institution of this kind for the homeless who either are unfitted to work or refuse to do honest labor, and who, after care and training, would be capable of self-support, New York and every other community in the State would be able quickly to rid themselves of this class of helpless beings and parasites. Switzerland's experience is proof of the practicability of this plan and the successful results that may be expected therefrom. In our own country we may find justification for the operation of such a colony in the results that Cleveland has obtained at its municipal farm.

To care for another class of the unemployable the New York Legislature in 1913 authorized the establishment of a much-needed State custodial asylum for feeble-minded delinquents. The spirit of procrastination was still virulent, however, and the Governor vetoed the bill.

The municipality of New York has committed itself to the policy of municipal care and treatment of inebriates. The establishment of a farm colony for this class of defectives has been authorized and a site has been selected. With an administration composed of men with a broad social vision and appreciative of the needs and the practicability of preventive and constructive social work, the hope of establishing this activity for the treatment of inebriates seems bright. But even with the completion of this municipal institution all of the needs will not have been met, for there is need of proper hospital facilities for the detention, compulsory if necessary, of homeless wanderers ill of tuberculosis, and convalescent homes for the care of poor persons after they have been discharged from city hospitals. To this list should be added adequate almshouse accommodations. And what New York needs to do on a large scale every other city should duplicate according to the size of its unemployed army.

With the sub-normals, unfitted, and incapacitated removed, cared for, and under treatment, how many of the thousands who apply for public aid in every city would be left to find employment for? That the number would be much less than the army every large community is now unsuccessfully laboring to help is the best reply we can make at this time. There are excellent grounds for the belief, however, that our task would be much easier. New York's study of its homeless applicants indicates this. Besides reducing the number of the unemployed, the problem of finding work for the employ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able would be less complicated. A greater number of employers would be more willing and more eager to co-operate for the reason that they would have confidence in the fitness of those in whose behalf relief agencies and city administrations are laboring to put on their feet again. As the situation is now this confidence is lacking, owing to the knowledge that many seeking work and in whose behalf work is being sought are not worthy of hire. Machinery quickly to connect the employer and the unemployed could then be set up and put in motion by the nation, States, and municipalities with more assurance of success than at present. The burden both of public and of private relief also would be materially reduced. The agencies in this field could then devote more time and effort among both the homeless and dependent families to so-called incipient poverty, the distress of which requires less funds to alleviate and the victims less time to rehabilitate physically, socially, and economically.

How many of the unemployed are unemployable? When we are able to answer this question with some degree of accuracy and to provide proper and adequate institutional care for the unfit and unfitted, we can more easily and more quickly bring together in this country those in need of work and those needing their services. By segregating the unemployable so that we can care for them and at the same time endeavor to rehabilitate them, we should make easier the task of finding employment for and of keeping employed the capable man who wants to work. We shall then be able to accomplish more through the organization of the labor market, the establishment of labor exchanges, and the regularization of business, and thereby reduce the number of unemployed who are employable, and the number of employers who need their services.

WILLIAM PARR CAPES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NUMBER OF INTERESTING NOVELS[1]

BY W. D. HOWELLS

FROM time to time as one advances in years, one feels obliged, by that sclerosis of the tastes which is apt to occur in old age, to abandon the world to its accumulated errors, and retire upon the superiority of the irrevocable past. At such moments it appears that there are no such novels as there once were, that fiction is not at all the thing it used to be; yet from time to time amidst the flattering despair in which one attributes to oneself a share of that vanished superiority, one has surprises of excellence in contemporary work. Some unimagined writer, hitherto quite unread, presents himself in a book perhaps unwillingly borrowed and provokes one to inquiry about the man who wrote it. He could not have written that story only; he must have done others, better or worse, and one goes on reading as many of his books as one can lay one's hands on.

It was *The Squire's Daughter* which led me on to *The Honor of the Clintons,* to *The Eldest Son,* to *Exton Manor,* and to *The Greatest of These,* in an order of reading which may not have been at all the order of their writing. I was so ignorant of recent English fiction as not to know any of Mr. Archibald Marshall's books by name even, and I was rather critically incredulous of my increasing pleasure in them. Let it be owned at once that it was not the deepest or widest pleasure, not of the proportion of the vast delight ministered by the supreme imaginations. But it was, and in my gratitude it is, a very genuine pleasure which I would

[1] *The Squire's Daughter, The Honor of the Clintons, The Eldest Son, Exton Manor, The Greatest of These.* By Archibald Marshall. Dodd, Mead & Co.
The Saturday's Child, The Rich Mrs. Burgoyne, Poor Dear Margaret Kirby, Mother. By Kathleen Norris. The Macmillan Company.
Clark's Field. By Robert Herrick. The Houghton Mifflin Company.
The Price of Love. By Arnold Bennett. Harper & Brothers.
The Letter of the Contract. By Basil King. Harper & Brothers.
The New Clarion. By Will N. Harben. Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not mar the sense of by any minifying reservations. It is too altogether inviting a feat to find this novelist in a measure the palingenesis of the somewhat shambling colossus that bestrode for a generation an ocean tide of political and clerical fiction; but certainly it is of the huge Anthony Trollope that one thinks recurrently in Mr. Marshall's studies of county-family character and circumstance and of the social, moral, and religious keeping of his squires, rectors, vicars, and curates. Yet it must be owned concurrently with this recognition that Mr. Marshall, if he is the revenant of Trollope, is a spirit who has profited in the passage of eternity, and has come back with a more delicate and more enlightened sense of his material. He has not so wide and strong a grasp of it, and he is more generous—that is to say, more just—to the human possibilities, even probabilities, in the sort of figures poured endlessly upon the scene by the greatest of the Victorian masters. His county families have learned something that Trollope's county families did not know; his clerics are less concerned for the Church than the work of the Church. In the book which I have just finished reading, the author has even ventured upon the perilous enterprise of finding common ground for Church and Dissent in their different uses of their common Christianity; and it seems to me that he has convincingly succeeded.

He does not always succeed, he does not always convince, and he is a strictly British Antæus, whose strength fails him when he lifts himself from English ground. His books rather abound in the American slang phrasing which the English like to use, but when he attempts an American figure like that of the Southern wife of *The Eldest Son,* in the Clinton series, it is not of the verity which animates the Southern women of our acquaintance. Worse yet, in this book the native material which serves him so well in the other Clinton books frays out. The story was perhaps necessary for the completion of the admirable portrait of the old squire, but even then it does not seem quite true to life in the reconciliation of the father and son through the intervention of the American wife who opportunely tucks her coat under the squire's head when he lies insensible from a cropper in the hunting-field. Her own father had left her penniless through his ruin by our Civil War, and after supporting herself by dancing on the stage in America she mar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ries a very worthless nobleman in England who duly makes her a rich widow. She remains uncharacterized by these experiences, and with the money inherited by a rich pork-packing Chicago uncle she becomes the wife of the squire's eldest son and the provisional victim of the old man's obdurate refusal to accept her in his family till she puts her coat under his head, that day. Then all quickly, too quickly, becomes right.

It is a pity; but I do mean that this failure is not without its redeeming features. The young Mrs. Clinton has moments of being true American, and, which is better, of being true woman, as the other women of Mr. Marshall almost unfailingly are. In fact his women figures are the most interesting and valuable addition he has made to the society of the far-reaching circle of English fiction. What amounts to a real find in the Clinton series is the discovery of woman's almost entire and quite unhopeful subjection in good English county families. The whole series bears witness to the fact more or less, but it is in the story of *The Squire's Daughter* that it is most clearly and interestingly studied. There is nothing consciously tendencious in Mr. Marshall's fiction, except as it all tends to good morals and good manners, to patience and kindness, but perhaps one might safely say that his view of woman's place in English society was almost scientific, and that his peculiar contribution to the knowledge of it is his chief contribution to polite literature. This knowledge rather pervades his books; none is quite without it, but it is chiefly characteristic of the Clinton series. The squire's wife, who is so much his better in mind and heart, perfectly accepts his ideal of woman's subordination, and only by a sort of accident in a sort of extremity, asserts herself in his behalf against it. But his eldest daughter realizes the injustice of it, the shame, the cruelty; she rebels against it, she runs away from it, hoping for escape to equality with men in the keeping of a brutal miscreant who has all the manly qualities but the good ones. Her utter ignorance of such a man's nature, her beautiful worldly innocence, her final good sense, and her fearless renunciation of him when she finds that he, self-made and free from the social traditions of her own caste, intends the same domestic enslavement that she has fled from, is something rather new in fiction; and it might go quite as far as suffragettic violence in convincing anti-suffragists of women's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right to equality at least in the "home," to which their prejudice relegates her equal gifts.

But of course what is valuable in the work of this agreeable artist is his portrayal of characters rather than types; and what is superior in it is the evolution of characters from types, of events from conditions. There is plot enough in his books, and more than enough for my pleasure, but I have learned to be tolerant of the pleasure which other people find in plots, and tender to the hard necessity of making them which the novelist is under. I even like things to happen, when they seem to happen naturally and perhaps inevitably, as I am bound to say that for the most part they do in Mr. Marshall's books. But the well-informed novel-reader will not find much that is new either in the country-life setting or county-family action of the stories. The scenes are as familiar as the dramas, but both are renewed to one's experience with an interest in them so genuine as to make them almost new; they have that freshness which traveling back over it gives a road one has come. The two books which seem most to escape into unwonted effect are by no means of the most unwonted environment; yet *Exton Manor,* with its protagonistic contrast of a Low Church great lady and a High Church vicar, and *The Greatest of These,* with the mutual discovery of the gentle dissenting minister and the conscientious rector that they are both of the same agency for charity and of an inevitable brotherhood, are of fresher import than the Clinton series, except for its feminist discovery. Such a statement of the main motives leaves the pleasant treatment of the motives ignored, and it is right to say that this treatment holds itself for the most part aloof from the dry gravel of didacticism which it now and then scrapes. Both books have in unwonted persons and incidents an infusion of new blood which becomes their life. In *Exton Manor,* Mrs. Prentice, the vicar's wife, makes one think of Trollope's Mrs. Proudie, but she is really not Mrs. Proudie, and the Australian widow who has been her deceased sister's successor in marriage is an element of unprecedented effect. Throughout *The Greatest of These* there is a humane unexpectedness which freshens the atmosphere, but the whole structure suffers rather than rejoices from paralleling the sin of the dissenting grocer's son by the same sort of sin in the rector's youth. Nothing is gained to the situation by it, and it really seems

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like an afterthought, an accident of invention which overtempted the author by its false *patness*. The larger lesson of the book, the always superlatively important lesson of life, could have been quite well imparted without it.

In reading Mr. Marshall's stories I have had the feeling, perhaps unjustifiable, that I was in the presence of a talent which had not quite found itself out. This might be said of any inventive talent; every talent of the sort is in the process of evolution which goes varying on from book to book, and probably never arrives at the complete recognition of itself. What I am always aware of in this author's work is an essential gentleness, a sort of artistic benevolence, of esthetic altruism, which holds itself superior to the worldly knowledge, or the knowledge of worldly character and circumstance, which he shows so convincingly. He does this, at least to my ignorance of the world, at every point, but most brilliantly, I think (doubtless, again, from my necessary republican ignorance of all such events), in the opening chapters of *The Squire's Daughter,* where he has to give the impression of something so supremely exalted as a court ball, in the most exalted of possible presences. It makes me feel as if I had been at a court ball, though not sorry that in any renewal of my long-lost youth I could not be; and if I were brought to book and made to say what I thought the most excellent piece of this author's writing, I might say that these chapters were.

It is a wild leap from the quiet of the English country air of Mr. Marshall's books to the Californian atmosphere of Mrs. Norris's story of *The Saturday's Child,* but it is rather from one level to another than from higher to lower. The manner of the two authors is as different as their matter, but they are both artists, and that for me is the great matter. What Mr. Marshall is apt to do is to work out very many, if not most, of his questions in long, long talks between two or more of his persons which he is able somehow to save from being dull ones; Mrs. Norris puts the problem or the fact, or the trait before you by quick, vivid touches of portraiture or action. Short of the highly dramaticized narrative of the greatest masters, the Russians, namely, her method is very masterly, and she works in material much stranger to us (shall I say?) cultivated Americans than either the English or the Russian novelists. We cultivated Americans (I am making so bold again) are better ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quainted with the nihilists and nobles of Petrograd (one already no longer says St. Petersburg) and the county families of the English country than with the rich and poor of San Francisco whom Mrs. Norris introduces to us in their form of society. After the first exploitation of California in the boldly theatricized types of Bret Harte and the richly grotesqued characterizations of Mark Twain, we had no report of a later life than these great humorists deal with, except in the mighty novels of Frank Norris. These were certainly enough for one while, but Mrs. Norris is very welcome in her still newer field, and none the less so when she reminds us of the young master who died in the prime of his greatness. She does not remind us of him often; her place is essentially her own and she is quite herself in it. If she lacks the final touch of Frank Norris's power as we feel it in the mysticism so consistent with his realism, she has the compensating gift of a more controlled and concentrated observation. She has the secret of closely adding detail to detail in a triumph of what another California author has called Littleism, but what seems to be nature's way of achieving Largeism. At any rate, it seems to me that Largeism is what Mrs. Norris achieves within the limits of her generous canvas, though she densely covers every inch of it with life studied in pre-Raphaelite minuteness.

Mrs. Norris seems to have wrought in the Tolstoyan faith of making Truth alone her hero, when she makes a little Irish-American girl her protagonist, and follows her from her hard work in the counting-room of a wholesale drug-house through her engagement to a rich, amiable, idle, heartless young proprietor of it, to her paid companionship in a rich, amiable, idle, heartless millionaire family, to her final happiness as the wife of a husband worthy of her "in her own class," the class of people who help others in helping themselves throughout their duteous lives. This is stating very dryly, very barely, the terms of a story which I found warmly humane throughout and was impatient with in nothing but the brevity of its great length. The author is bound in it to no epical design such as governed the achievements of Frank Norris; it is quite without pivotal action; it simply goes on and on with a full sufficiency, but not a superfluity, of persons for the transaction of the drama, or for the illustration of the fact which nowhere seems fiction, unless it is in the representation of such a very large plurality of the San

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Franciscans as Catholics. They are a good deal like the voting plurality of Bostonians in that, and it is no harm, but one wonders if it is quite the case. In Boston there is still a minority of Protestants engaged in commercial, professional, and intellectual pursuits of several sorts who could not well be left out of any such exhaustive study of the place as Mrs. Norris seems to make of San Francisco, where the people of her fiction, rich and poor alike, in or out of society, and of whatever derivation, are tacitly or explicitly Catholics. It is no harm; one merely asks if it is not through an oversight that they are represented so; though with those of Irish origin or of Maryland derivation there need be no such question.

Those Marylanders, Baltimore or San Francisco born, are delightful, and they are drawn with a loving skill which commends the artist as well as her sitters. The courage of the women in their struggle with adversity is beautifully shown, and the strain of unwonted industry in the slack-twisted fiber of character formed for leisure is endearingly and touchingly appreciated. The little Irish-American protagonist who shares their ready cousinship and the hospitality of their poverty is worthy of them, and of the friendly fate which she finds waiting her at the end of her experience with the world of work and the world of play. I have the feeling that she is not romanced in these experiences, and that the unemployed over-rich are no more unequally dealt with than the poor, though this is perhaps because I do not know the over-rich well enough to like them, and prefer to have them shown at the best vacuously idle, lavish in their daily lives, and without any proper *raison d'être*. But can it be that one of them would be so mean as to buy a poor woman's invention for $500 and give her nothing from the $25,000 which he sells it for; or that the rich girl who pays her sister's companion $60 a month scants her with a check for $50 when they part in a week less than the last month? Perhaps the over-rich of the Pacific Slope are different from the over-rich of the Atlantic States or the Middle West. Yet they seem to have enjoyed the same civilizing influence through education and sojourn in Europe, and to be devoted to the same sports and amusements, both sexes, with the women assiduously feeding one another at lunches and teas of every expensive invention.

One cannot wholly distrust Mrs. Norris's report if one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

takes Mr. Herrick's word to the same effect in his story of *Clark's Field*. There is nothing consciously tendencious in his book any more than in Mrs. Norris's, but whoever tells the truth about conditions and their cause and consequence is unconsciously tendencious in his work, and points the old, old moral that some sort of useful work is the savior of the race. The reason why the Jack of our American millionairicism is such an ugly mere toy is that in the first generation from the shirt-sleeves which earned or stole the millions, the silk attire has nothing to do in its limitless leisure, except to be amusingly or offensively empty and idle, without duties, without aims, without hopes or fears. Its only function is to constitute "society" as we know it in the flattering report of the society pages of the papers or in the pages of such pitiless fictions as *The Saturday's Child* and *Clark's Field*. The very close, pre-Raphaelite method of Mrs. Norris seems more reproductive of the fact than Mr. Herrick's broader handling, but they are both to the same effect, and they are both convincing and disheartening. It seems as if our wealth, abound and superabound as it will, can never come even to the poor effect of English birth as we see it in Mr. Marshall's pictures of country-life and county-family portraits. To be sure it took centuries to produce English birth or its constituent classes, and it takes only one little lifetime or less to produce American wealth. But apparently our wealth in the newer parts of the country is not ambitious of birth; "it gets there" without birth, without county family and its duties; it devotes itself to travel, to sport, to lunches and presents; it crawls, it snubs, and without content is entirely self-satisfied; it fulfils the human destiny of unhappiness, and so far it is no worse off than poverty, though it never enjoys the wholesome rest that comes from the weariness of hard work.

I said the newer parts of the country, but wealth is not more homeless there than in the older parts, and enjoys no more reverence or even envy. The scene of Mr. Herrick's story is in the East, in a town so near Boston as to suggest Cambridge, and though it almost ends in California, there the parity between it and Mrs. Norris's story ends. Its protagonist is not an Irish-American girl well related to Southern people: it is a large lot of land in the heart of that town, which a plain, apparently very dull, little New England girl inherits to the expropriation of a great number

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of cousins, all with an equal moral and legal claim to the land, but not timely on the ground, and not befriended by the interest of interested people otherwise uninterested in her or her welfare. Mr. Herrick means to write the history of this lot of land, or field; to make it the great figure in his tale, to tell how it grows from a shabby vacant space into an ugly, densely crowded space, with commerce and manufacture and industry housing and homing upon it, and appreciates in value till the poor plain little, poor dull little girl in growing into an experienced and thoughtful, unhappy wife has become immeasurably a millionaire through the more than gold that the earth of the field has turned into. Inevitably the process of character in her far surpasses in interest any possible fact of the field's transubstantiation from earth to wealth. The field is always slipping out of sight, and the growing child and grown woman filling the vision.

I feel it a pity in any review of a book that no review can parallel it in length and breadth, but under the literary conditions that is not possible; and quotation is a poor, awkward makeshift. So I must send the reader to Mr. Herrick's book itself for a due sense of his effectiveness in studying the demoralizing schools in New York and Paris from whose finishing his little girl escapes not quite so distorted in ideals as not to have left in her the stuff for a good life far beyond any good living she knows. Through the kind offices of a just judge (almost too consolingly righteous for entire belief) she becomes the ward of one of those Trust Companies which now fulfil the obligations of the adoptive parents of difficult wealthy orphans; and its trials in discharging the duties of her moral and intellectual nurture form the vein of humor, too sparingly worked for my pleasure, which runs through the story. The Trust Company means so honestly well by her, and does its duty so kindly according to its lights, and yet is so drolly unable to deal with her as a human girl, who grows more and more baffling as she grows older, and gets married and leaves her husband, pending his much-merited divorce, and wishes to give their share of the Clark's Field riches to the other Clark heirs, so intangible and undeserving and otherwise impossible. She is decided against them by the extremely hard-headed far-off cousin whom she discovers in a stone-mason working on her place in California, and who impartially represents them as a stupid and unworthy lot. He is himself not above

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his station in many things, but as she has come to regard any sort of handwork as a badge of merit, his being so mainly a mere stone-mason rather commends him at first, though his being a mere man goes finally to her heart. Marriage with him seems to be lurking in the background of the uncompleted divorce; but that personal question is of course more easily solved than the problem of *Clark's Field*, which the author probably wishes us to regard as his "hero."

It is difficult, and yet it is not impossible, and if some such end is what Mr. Herrick is after, I shall be interested to see how he achieves it in some more explicit design. But I warn him that there are many lions and, worse yet, lionesses in his path which he will find hungering more for the love-affairs of his next book than for the solution of its ethico-economic questions. After all, humanity is made up of men and women, rather than of their holdings, in common or severalty, and it will be long before humanity will care more for the economic questions, so intimately bound up with the ethical questions, than for the question of who gets who in a story. I myself, abandoned believer as I am in pecuniary equality as the only reasonable hope of our species, must confess that I care less to know that Clark's Field rightfully belonged to the workers whose toil turned it into wealth and not to the lawful heirs, than whether the cousins ultimately marry. I know from long experience of fiction that they do; but I would like to be at the wedding.

I speak of these two persons because Mr. Herrick has especially interested me in them; but there are others whom he has interested me in: the rich, vulgar, idle, empty-headed, empty-hearted girls whom the unscrupulous mistresses of such educational establishments as Herndon Hall on the Hudson, and Villa Poniatowski in Paris, scarcely pretend to school, by precept or example, in anything but worldly selfishness and hardness. Poor little Adelle Clark is placed by the Trust Company in the tutelage of these women and the companionship of their pupils, and it is natural, almost inevitable, for her to choose the most entirely worthless young man she knows for her love, and to woo and wed him more by her will than his. When she goes with him to live in California after the Trust Company pathetically reconciles itself to her escapade, she changes her sky, but not her mind, and she lives the life of the California rich which Mrs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Norris more minutely, but not more vividly, paints than Mr. Herrick.

Am I, perhaps, and without well realizing it, perhaps, really studying a new school of fiction in this paper where I proposed nothing so serious, or mainly, indeed, more than the expression of my pleasure in Mr. Marshall's books? Is this new school which I find myself studying so much more strenuously than I meant, to be called the meticulous school? Mr. Marshall in his closely talked-out predicaments certainly seems meticulous; Mrs. Norris, if she is anything, is in everything meticulous; Mr. Herrick, who would have you think he was of a dramatic breadth in his purpose of making an economic fact his protagonist, is certainly as meticulous as any one in his handling of the actualities and potentialities of *Clark's Field*. Then if I come to Mr. Arnold Bennett's story of *The Price of Love*, how am not I tangled in the very finest, closest meshes of meticulosity? Mr. Bennett might in fact be said, if one did not mind what one said, to be the very most meticulous of all my authors, as he has proved in other stories of his; though in this story he seems to be concerned with such broad, bold interests as stealing a large sum of money, and with the thieves' confessing and finding each other out, as well as with the fine, small impulses which compose the massive emotions of a girl so in love with one of the thieves that she is glad to pay the price of her passion not merely by marrying him but by holding his badness dearer than any good in the world. Perhaps she would not have done this, but Mr. Bennett says she did, and in a manner he proves it. In any case, "he is the doctor," and the reader, if he will be his patient, must take the medicine he prescribes. The reality of the story exists in the character, rather than the action, in what the people are rather than in what they do. But the reader hesitates, dubitates; he halts, kicks; perhaps his mood throughout is one long kick. He feels that people declared to be so and so would not probably do so and so; but in life, Mr. Bennett may say, people are continually doing the impredicable. It is not for my school of criticism, if I have any, to say that is not enough, to insist that art must not merely imitate nature, but must surpass her in her own line. Yet somehow the probable rather than the natural should be the ideal; or, should not it?

I hope that in all this I have not been saying that the story

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not most interesting, most amusing, most meticulously admirable in the portrayal of character and the traits of character. So far it is one of the author's masterpieces, and only one of his prentice-pieces in leaving the reader with the doubt whether it happened. With Mr. Basil King's brief novel, *The Letter of the Contract,* there is no such doubt; one knows that the thing did not happen on the terms stated, though the papers may be full of just such things. In this labyrinthine book, which I will not deny having read through at one go—

> From morn till noon, from noon till dewy eve,
> A summer's day—

with quite impassioned interest, there is a too-typical couple who rebel against the author's evident purpose of making them characters, and whose enforced experience remains an allegory, an instance, an admonition. The husband has had a mistress and still has, and the wife divorces him; each marries again, and then they meet after years and find themselves still in love with each other. The second husband leaves it to them what they will do; the twice-wife may divorce him and let the twice-husband divorce his second wife and remarry the first. It is difficult, but not impossible, in law at least, though something like impossible in gospel. The solution is that "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," and apparently the spirit here is that both must remain constant to the error of their second marriages. The arrival at this precept is by what the Italians in a false addition call a *salto mortale,* and it is not clear that these miserable people in continuing true to their mistake are not living in sin, though Mr. King seems to think it is, unless I have misread him. What there is no doubt about is the hold which the tale takes on the reader's interest, and its intensive culture of his expectation, with moments of nature, of real pathos, of genuine emotion. It is needless to say, however, and this apparently is why I say it, that the book is no such book as *The Way Home,* with its true hopes and high consolations. As a solution of the divorce question it has the prime defect of not solving; and it may be that there *is* no solution of that question. There are some things in this world which it seems we cannot get round, but there is no doubt of the sincere and devoted endeavor of the talent which I think has failed here to find a way round.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not more, and certainly it is not less, sincere than the talent which in Mr. Marshall's books strives for justice and charity. If I have not yet recognized as a finer and truer feminism the animating principle of his county-family fiction, let me do so now without more delay, and in his more religious-minded stories, such as *Exton Manor* and *The Greatest of These,* not fail to note what seems to me his special quality. He has not contented himself, like the possibly too-prototypical Trollope, with merely the Church, the Church life and character, but has done what Trollope never did in imagining in Dissent a friend as well as foe worthy of the Establishment's trust and affection. In this respect his last book is his best, and while all his books are partially if not wholly admirable, it seems his most personal, most individual book.

If *The Price of Love* and *The Letter of the Contract* are tunes played each upon one string, in *The New Clarion* Mr. Harben sounds a various note, though he is here what we have already known him: a lover of the old-fashioned make of romance, while so different in the make of his characters. His scene is still as persistently Northern Georgia as Mr. Phillpotts's has been the moors of Devonshire, Mr. Hardy's Wessex, Mr. Bennett's The Five Towns. I am yet in doubt whether he sees his North Georgians as detachedly as I might like him to do; but however this may be, it is all very interesting, and perhaps he makes me see his people the more clearly because he does not always seem conscious of their primitive outlook or onlook, does not draw them as if he were uneasily aware of New York judging the effect over his shoulder. He has new stuff here in what probably promised to be his main theme, and he first makes some studies of a country newspaper in a small town beginning to feel its future; but before he goes far he drops these studies and enters upon the vital business of his book, the morbid anatomy of guilty conscience in a backwoodsman only a little above the four-footed, wild things of his native backwoods. This part of his work is the masterly part of it; all the rest is comparatively prenticework, however good it is, and I am not saying that some, that much, of it is not very good. Only, in this part the unhappy man is brought to the confession of the murder he has done, as subtly, as powerfully, as Raskolnikoff is brought to confession in *Crime and Punishment.* The case, without at all accusing the invention of Mr. Har-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ben, strongly recalled to me the case conceived by Dostoyevsky. Allowing for difference in the material (though this is as much the human soul in the one case as in the other), our North Georgian novelist deals with it as authentically as the Russian, though not with his far-reaching suggestion. In fact, the question with Abe Fulton's soul was not so complex as with Raskolnikoff's. The homicide which his primitive passion of revenge, of "wild justice," drove him to do, did not involve the deep guilt of the ambitious student, and his confession of it contained the redemption which it is the triumph of Dostoyevsky to ascertain, in his pursuit of Raskolnikoff's conscience, as the final effect of his punishment.

It is interesting to trace in Mr. Harben's story, as in Mrs. Norris's and Mr. Herrick's, the working of the same ideal toward economical equality. It is not very declared in either of them as a doctrine or a principle; it is rather, in all, the recognition of the failure of wealth as a source of happiness. In the work of Mr. Marshall and the like of him, the failure of birth as a source of happiness may be less explicit, but the recognition of the fact is one of the oldest traditions of English poetry, whether verse or prose, and he has inherited his full share of it. His reader, if he reads between the lines, may read it as easily as he may read the revolt from wealth as an ideal in the work of the Americans I have been trying duly to praise. Among these I suppose that I am presently interested most in the work of Mrs. Norris, though it is not, on the whole, so high or deep or wide as that of the others at their highest and deepest and widest, but is richest in the elements of the merest humanity. There is something quite absolute in its democracy, except for that droll allegiance to "family" which she feels herself somehow obliged every now and then to testify. I suppose her to be a Californian, and I am too ignorant of Californian conditions to be able to say whether the aristocratic sense as it survives there is of a Southern origin or not, but in Mrs. Norris's people it seems to be so. It seems in one case at least of rather uncertain recollection, for it is not credible that any Southern family could bear the distinctively New England name of Quincy. When it comes to the Southerners as Mrs. Norris gives them in any degree of actuality, I am bound to say they are delightful, not only as one finds them in *The Saturday's Child,* but in the minor fiction along the way to that supreme arrival. Perfectly charming, and perfectly Southern, though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of course not exclusively Southern, is the character studied in the delightful sketch *Making Allowances for Mamma,* which is one of Mrs. Norris's many pieces of lovable fun and pathos. There is a whole little book given to the worship of motherhood in that called *Mother,* which endears the author equally with her heroine for her brave, frank, loving fealty to the common life and its conditions. *The Rich Mrs. Burgoyne* is perhaps too exemplary, too much an allegory; it is so truthfully circumstanced that one cannot deny it happened, but one doubts. Everywhere, however, the undoubtable is abundant in the work of this pleasing artist, who is not afraid to find beauty everywhere, not only in the gardened spaces, but in the weed-grown alleys of life; she is of such high courage that she makes you feel this beauty in an Irish undertaker's family, the like of which has not happened since Dickens dared it. Her art is always art for truth's sake and goodness' sake, and mostly for hope's sake. It deals with commonness on the highest as well as the lowest social levels, and on all the planes between, not to flatter or belie, but to make the scene and the figures live before you by truth to them. I who have always loved the films and their measureless possibility for good will not be thought to underpraise her work when I call it a moving-picture show.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORKMANSHIP OF "MACBETH"—III

BY SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

VII

We come now to Banquo, who really *has* individual character: and the more we study Banquo (limned for us in a very few strokes, by the way), the more, I think, we find cause to wonder at Shakespeare as a workman. The *Chronicle* makes Banquo guilty as an accomplice before the fact. Here are Holinshed's words:

> At length, therefore, communicating his purposed intent with his trustie friendes, amongst whom Banquho was the chiefest, upon confidence of theyr promised ayde, he (Macbeth) slewe the King at Envernes, etc.

Now, in the play, on the eve of the murder, Macbeth does seem to hang for a moment on the edge of imparting his purpose to Banquo, who has just brought him the King's diamond. "I dreamt," says Banquo—

> I dreamt last night of the three weird sisters—
> To you they have showed much truth.

Macbeth returns:

> I think not of them:
> Yet, when we can extract an hour to serve,
> We would spend it in some words upon this business,
> If you would grant the time.

And Banquo replies:

> At your kindest leisure.

His leisure! Macbeth's "kindest leisure" at that moment! Remember it when we come to say a word on the all-pervading irony of this play. The dialogue goes on:

> MACBETH: If you should cleave to my consent, when 'tis,
> It shall make honor for you.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BANQUO: So I lose none
In seeking to augment it, but still keep
My bosom franchis'd and allegiance clear,
I shall be counsell'd.
MACBETH: Good repose the while!
BANQUO: Thanks, sir, the like to you!

Now, why did Shakespeare avoid the *Chronicle* at this point and send Banquo to bed with a clear conscience? The commentators are ready, as usual. "Why, don't you *see?* Banquo was to be father to a line of kings the last of whom, in 1603, had inherited the throne of England also, 'and two-fold balls and treble scepters swayed.' It would never do, in a play written some time before 1610 for performance by His Majesty's Servants, to depict His Majesty's Scottish forebear as an accomplice in treason."

True, profoundly true! And even illuminating in its way! But it scarcely illustrates the way in which dramatic masterpieces are constructed.

I think we shall find two capital artistic reasons—one simple, the other subtle, but both potent—why Shakespeare did not involve Banquo in Macbeth's guilt.

In the first place, it is surely obvious that by sharing the plot up with Banquo and other "trustie friendes" (in Holinshed's phrase) Shakespeare would have destroyed the impressiveness of Macbeth and his wife. In proportion as he dragged in a crowd, and just so far, would he have shortened the stature, blurred the outlines, marred the effect of that tremendous pair, who, as it is, command us by the very isolation of their grandeur in guilt.

The second reason is subtler, though scarcely less strong. In all great literature there is always a sense of the norm. Even in Shakespeare's most terrific and seismic inventions—when, as in "Hamlet" or in "Lear," he seems to be breaking up the solid earth under our feet—there is always some point and standard of sanity to which all enormities and passionate errors are referred by us, unconsciously, for correction; and which the agitated mind of the spectator settles back as upon its center of gravity.

A convincing exposition of this principle will be found in Coventry Patmore's *Principle in Art.* He calls it the *punctum indifferens,* or Point of Rest. In a painting (he shows) it may be—often is—something apparently insignificant: a sawn-off stump in a landscape of Constable's;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Dresden Madonna of Raphael the heel of the Infant—which yet, as we know, was to bruise the Serpent's head. "Cover these from sight," says he, "and, to the moderately sensitive and cultivated eye, the whole life of the picture will be found to have been lowered." But, he continues:

> It is in the most elaborate plays of Shakespeare that we find this device in its fullest value; and it is from two or three of these that I shall draw my main illustration of a little-noticed but very important principle of art. In "King Lear" it is by the character of Kent; in "Romeo and Juliet," by Friar Laurence; in "Hamlet," by Horatio; in "Othello," by Cassio; and in "The Merchant of Venice," by Bassanio, that the point of rest is supplied. . . . Thus Horatio is the exact *punctum indifferens* between the opposite excesses of the characters of Hamlet and Laertes—over-reasoning inaction and unreasoning action—between which extremes the whole interest of the play vibrates. The unobtrusive character of Kent is, as it were, the eye of the tragic storm which rages round it; and the departure, in various directions, of every character more or less from moderation, rectitude, or sanity, is the more clearly understood or felt from our more or less conscious reference to him. So with the central and comparatively unimpressive characters in many other plays—characters unimpressive on account of their facing the exciting and trying circumstances of the drama with the regard of pure reason, justice, and virtue. Each of these characters is a peaceful focus radiating the calm of moral solution throughout all the difficulties and disasters of surrounding fate: a vital center, which, like that of a great wheel, has little motion in itself, but which at once transmits and controls the fierce revolution of the circumference.

Now, in "Macbeth" Banquo supplies this Point of Rest. He is—though on an enlarged scale, having to stand beside the "hero"—the Ordinary Man. Like Macbeth, he is a thane, a general, a gallant soldier. The two have fought side by side for the same liege-lord and, without jealousy, have helped each other to conquer. They are brought upon the stage together, two equal friends returning from victory. To him as to Macbeth the witches' predictions are offered. Macbeth shall be King of Scotland; Banquo shall beget kings. But whereas Macbeth, taking evil for good and under persuasion of his wife as well as of the supernatural, grasps at the immediate means to the end, Banquo, like an ordinary, well-meaning, sensible fellow, *does not do it,* and therefore on the fatal night can go like an honest man to his dreams.

This is not to say that Banquo did not feel the temptation. Shakespeare would not have been Shakespeare if he had not made Banquo feel it. The point is that, feeling it, I do not say strongly—it may have been lethargically, as ordi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nary decent men *do* feel the spur to enterprises which mean the casting off of honor, Banquo did not yield to it; and, as it seems to me, Dr. Bradley wastes a great deal of subtlety in trying to show him an accessory after the event, since he apparently acquiesces in Macbeth's attainment of the crown while suspecting his guilt. For or against this I shall only quote Banquo's own words when the murder is discovered:

> Fears and scruples shake us:
> In the great hand of God I stand, and thence
> Against the undivulged pretence I fight
> Of treasonous malice.

But why should we weigh how much or how little Banquo knew and chose to be silent about? What matters is that of the two soldiers one is tempted and yields, the other is tempted but does not.

And it matters in this way, that from the moment Macbeth yields and apparently succeeds, Banquo, who has not yielded, becomes a living reproach to him. He is the shadowiest of dangers; but his mere innocence foredooms him to be the skeleton at the feast; and therefore Macbeth's first instinct is by removing Banquo to obliterate the standard of decency, of loyalty—if that loyalty were partial only, why, then the more credit for obeying it—which survives to accuse him. So Banquo becomes naturally the first sacrifice to be paid to a guilty conscience, and Banquo is murdered.

VIII

But Banquo is murdered midway in Act III. A half of the play has to come and we have wiped out the one man who, on the principle we have been examining, is the touchstone to test the wrong from the reasonably right. All the other characters are mere shadows of men, painted on the flat. Macduff survives to be the avenger, but he is to be the avenger by no strength of his own, and he survives (as most of us will agree) by a pretty base action, fleeing the country and leaving his wife and children behind, unprotected.

Have critics yet considered the artistic value of Lady Macduff, and more specially the artistic value of the boy, little Macduff?—one of those gallant, precocious, straight-talking children in whom Shakespeare delighted—it may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because he had lost such a son, at just such an age. Reading carefully, let us note how this boy is introduced close after Macbeth's purposed visit to the Witches—he seeking them this time. (Another touch of insight: it is always the Devil who first accosts, and the victim who later pays the visits, seeking ways).

Straight upon that foul scene in the cavern light breaks, for the last time in the drama, in the sunny wisdom of a child. Good gospel, too, as I take it.

> "Was my father a traitor, mother?"
> "Ay, that he was."
> "What *is* a traitor?"

And so on. "Now God help thee, poor monkey!" says his mother at length (irony again) and while the Murderer is at the gate, being admitted—

"Where is your husband? . . . He's a traitor," are the words in the Murderer's mouth.

"Thou liest, thou shag-hair'd villain," answers up the proud, plucky boy a moment before he is stabbed.

All these pretty ones end tragically in Shakespeare; but surely you see that this one in this play lives his few moments not wholly in vain.

IX

The wonderful counterpoise of will and character between Macbeth and his wife has been so often and, on the whole, so well discussed that I shall take leave to say very little about it. But two brief notes I will make:

(1) Looking into the matter historically, I cannot find that critics ever began to do Lady Macbeth justice until Mrs. Siddons taught them. Johnson, for example, wrote that "Lady Macbeth is merely detested." A truly amazing judgment to one who was privileged to watch Ellen Terry rehearsing the part, and again to watch John Sargent painting her, in her green robe of beetles' wings, as she stood in the act of lifting the crown to her brow!

Exquisitely chosen moment! For, reading the play carefully, let us observe how, for her, everything ends in that achievement. Up to it, hers has been the tiger nature, with every faculty glued, tense on the purpose, the prey; her husband but a half-hearted accomplice. The end achieved, it would seem that the spring of action somehow breaks within her. It is Macbeth who, like a man, shoulders the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weight of moral vengeance. *She* almost fades out. She is always the great lady; and while she can, she helps. They are both great: never one vulgar word of reproach or recrimination passes between them. But they drift apart. Macbeth no longer relies on her. Uncounseled by her, he seeks the Witches again, solitary pursues his way; and *her* mental anguish is left to be watched by a Doctor and a Gentlewoman. It is but reported to her husband. When the wail of the waiting-woman announces her death, he is busy arming himself for his doom. All he finds to say on the word "dead" is:

> She should have died hereafter:
> *There* would have been a time for such a word.

Through its strong simplicity of plot, its flattening of the stage as of all the subsidiary characters, its working out of vengeance by agents who are carefully kept as mere puppets in the hand of Heaven, "Macbeth" bears a resemblance unique among Shakespeare's writings to Greek tragedy; nor can it by accident be full of that irony in which the Greek tragedians—say Sophocles—delighted.

But it is to be observed that the irony most prevalent in "Macbeth" is, if not an invention of Shakespeare's own, at least not the usual tragic irony, that consists in making the protagonist utter words which, coming on the momentary occasion to his lips, convey to the audience (who know what he does not) a secondary, sinister, prophetic meaning.

Now there is some of this irony in "Macbeth"; but its peculiar irony is retrospective rather than prophetic. It does not prepare the spectator for what is to come; but rather, when it comes, reminds him as by an echo that it has been coming all the while. Thus, when Macbeth and Lady Macbeth stare—how differently!—at their bloodied fingers, *he* says:

> Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
> Clean from my hand?

—while she says confidently:

> A little water clears us of this deed.

The irony is not yet. It comes in after-echo, in the sleep-walking scene, when (*he* having passed beyond account of it) *she* says, "Here's the smell of blood still! All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So when the ghost of Banquo seats itself at the banquet, we catch, as by echo, the insistent invitation,

> Fail not at our feast,

with the promise:—

> My lord, I will not:

as, when Macbeth calls out on the same ghost,

> What man dares, I dare: . . .
> Take any shape but that,

we hear again:—

> I dare do all that may become a man:
> Who dares do more is none.

Again, when Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane, do we not catch again the whisper,

> Stones have been known to move and trees to speak?

The whole play, as it were a corridor of dark Inverness Castle, resounds with such echoes; and I know nothing that matches it in these whispers (as I will call them) of reminiscent irony.

X

The whole play (as I have said and as others have said before me) curiously resembles Greek tragedy in a dozen ways, of which I will mention but one more—though it is full of blood and images of blood, the important blood-shedding is hidden, removed from the spectator's sight. There is, to be sure, a set scene for Banquo's murder; but it can be omitted without detriment to the play, and, in fact, always is omitted. Duncan is murdered off the stage; Lady Macbeth dies off the stage; Macbeth makes his final exit, fighting, to be killed off the stage. There is nothing here like the "blood-bolter'd" culmination of Hamlet.

Now and lastly—for there is no space left to argue it—I will only profess my belief (conviction, rather) that this tragedy so curiously resembling classical tragedy does, in fact, overpass in its bold workmanship any classical tragedy.

As we remember, Milton, of Christ's College, Cambridge, once proposed to rewrite "Macbeth." The entry—to be seen in Trinity College Library—runs: "'Macbeth,' beginning at the arrival of Malcolm at Macduff. The matter of Duncan may be expressed by the appearing of his ghost."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Milton, in effect, wished to cast "Macbeth" in the strict form of classical tragedy, as he afterward cast "Samson Agonistes." And Professor Richard Moulton has actually taken Shakespeare's "Macbeth" and, by one of the most brilliant *tours de force* in modern criticism (I say this quite deliberately), recast it, with a Chorus and all, step by step back into a Greek tragedy.

He uses scarcely anything that cannot be found in Shakespeare. It is an exquisite performance. But his permanent scene is, of course, Dunsinane Castle, not Inverness. That is, the play begins when all but the slow retribution—all that we first think of Macbeth—is concluded.

> "I have done the deed. Didst thou not hear a noise?"
>
> "Infirm of purpose,
> Give me the daggers."
>
> (Knock, knock, knock.)

And he begins with a Prologue spoken by Hecate. Hecate!—I have said nothing of her because, to be quite frank, I do not yet understand her. The commentators, ready as usual, surmise that Middleton, or somebody like Middleton, interpolated Hecate. I hesitate to accept this. It does *not* appear likely to me that a whole set of foolish men (though Middleton in itself seems a well-enough-invented name) were kept permanently employed to come in and write something whenever Shakespeare wanted it foolish.

But . . . Hecate!

After all, Professor Moulton's *tour de force,* though he casts it into strophes and antistrophes, is only John Milton's "'Macbeth' beginning at the arrival of Malcolm at Macduff."

Short of Shakespeare's, it could hardly have been better.

ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSIC AND DRAMA

SIGNIFICANT HAPPENINGS OF THE MONTH

Concerning some New Plays and some Skilful Acting.—A Word to Certain Young American Song-Writers.

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN

THERE are few more familiar complaints among the amiable Bourbons of criticism than that which assumes and deplores the absence of fine and skilful miming in the theater of to-day. We are told that the commercializing of our stage, the appalling celerity with which "stars" spring into being, the steady corruption of public taste, have brought the modern theater to a sorry pass, and have made it an easy victim to that devouring monster, the moving-picture play. What, indeed, have not our discouraged veterans of theatrical criticism said in dispraise of the theater of our time? No doubt it is easier to play the rôle of a critical Jeremiah than a critical Moses—at least it involves no perils, though it would seem to provide, at best, a melancholy joy. Yet there are some of us who prefer to side with the prophets of modernity—who would say of the drama of to-day what Mr. Henry M. Alden (a veteran whose youthful heart and spirit put to shame the croaking misoneism of indurated orthodoxy) has said of the fiction of to-day: that it has "more varied traits than that which preceded it, . . . a deeper dramatic interest, intellectually and emotionally, though it is changed to follow the pattern which life itself makes, yet in its course unfolding novel surprises; above all, it has more spontaneous play of human activities and a finer and more vital humor." And that, it seems to many, is no less true of the histrionism of our time. The other day Mr. Charles Frohman breathed life into the ancient arteries of Sardou's "Dora," garbing its deciduous frame in the habiliments of to-day,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and permitted Mr. Gillette, Miss Blanche Bates, Miss Marie Doro, and others to transform its conventionalized puppets into verifiable and veracious human beings. For these bounties he was rewarded as he might have expected to be rewarded; he was reproached because Mr. Gillette and the others did not play the familiar personages of "Diplomacy" as their predecessors had played them. There was small recognition of the fact that Mr. Gillette, for example, instead of playing Henry Beauclerc in the traditional manner, was sufficiently penetrating, imaginative, resourceful, original, and adroit to persuade you that you had known Henry, that you liked him, that you wanted to know him again. This was not Mr. Gillette trying to imitate Charles Coghlan, or Mr. Gillette *imitating himself*: it was an actor of creative intuition and rare skill setting before you a Beauclerc of irresistible humanity. This was acting of extraordinary competence—artistry that was stimulating, delightful, reassuring.

And when you have seen Mr. Gillette achieving this quiet triumph of recreative miming on the stage of the Empire, go to Mr. Winthrop Ames's Little Theater and observe that masterpiece of comic delineation, the Sam Thornhill of Mr. Kenneth Douglas in that delectable and delicately wicked portrayal of English Society, "A Pair of Silk Stockings." It would have been the easiest thing in the world to make Sam merely a "silly-ass" Briton of the familiar sort; and none but an actor of the finest artistic tact, the most scrupulous artistic honor, would have resisted the temptation. We doubt very much whether the light comedian of a generation ago would have forborne to make a caricature of this ventripotent young swell, with his foppish attire, his monocle, his amiable vacuity, his comic despairs, who, in disguise, secretes himself in his divorced wife's bedroom in order that he may win her back to him, and who is discovered and captured as a burglar while engaged in that adventure. Mr. Douglas does not play him in the spirit of farce; he does not for a moment caricature the part; on the contrary, he acts the rôle with such exquisite restraint, such unflagging veracity, so unobtrusively building up the character before your eyes by innumerable little strokes of subtle yet vivid portraiture, that the egregious Sam becomes and remains a part of your experience as a living and indefeasible personality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pursue your journey still further, now, to Wallack's, where is to be seen the Lieblers' production of Mr. Shaw's joyous "romance" (as he slyly calls it), "Pygmalion," and observe the inimitable performance of Mrs. Patrick Campbell, that former mistress of poetic tragedy and tragi-comedy, that erstwhile Electra, Mélisande, Mrs. Ebbsmith, as Eliza Doolittle, the cockney flower-girl of Covent Garden, who was made over into a fine lady by the phonetic necromancy of Henry Higgins. The play itself is not one of Mr. Shaw's most dazzling exhibitions of virtuosity. He is not here so incandescent in wit, so captivatingly audacious, as he is capable of being; yet it is still true of him that he makes every one of his contemporaries among writers for the stage seem, by comparison, a little flat and lymphatic, a little prosaic and quotidian. It is not easy to imagine "Pygmalion" without Mrs. Campbell's expert and delicious characterization of the transformed flower-girl; one refuses to believe that any other actress now on the stage could make Eliza live before us with an equal vividness and completeness. She must fill with happiness the heart of Mr. Shaw—especially in that unforgetable scene in the third act when the Professor exhibits for the first time, in his mother's drawing-room, the finished product of his experiments. We love to remember her painfully meticulous delivery of polite commonplaces concerning the weather, followed by a transition to more personal matters, and then that wonderful, that breath-catching recital—in the language of the slums but with the intonation of Mayfair—of old man Doolittle's dalliance with the grape:

"It never," recites Eliza, with fastidiously polished enunciation, "did him no harm, what I could see. But then he did not keep it up regular. On the burst, as you might say, from time to time. And always more agreeable when he had a drop in. When he was out of work, my mother used to give him fourpence and tell him to go out and not come back until he'd drunk himself cheerful and loving-like. There's lots of women has to make their husbands drunk to make them fit to live with. You see, it's like this: If a man has a bit of a conscience, it always takes him when he's sober; and then it makes him low-spirited. A drop of booze just takes that off and makes him happy."

It is the fault neither of Mrs. Campbell, nor of Mr. Shaw, by the way, that the famous epithet which was intended to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horrify British ears falls quite innocuously upon the hearing of New York audiences at Wallack's.

"What is life," says Higgins, "but a series of inspired follies?" That—almost—is a description of Mr. Shaw at his best: a creator of inspired follies; and it all but fits his "Pygmalion." Would that all the comedies of the absurdly lamented past came as near to deserving it as does this delightful whimsicality, so superlatively realized, in its central feature, by the admirable craft of Mrs. Campbell.

If we are still in some doubt as to the decay of the art of acting in our time, let us proceed now to the playhouse where that unpredictable genius, David Belasco, has seen fit to set before us one of the most ingenious and original comedies that the metropolitan stage has witnessed in many a day, but which is no more memorable than the acting that gives it life.

"The Phantom Rival" is an adaptation, by the accomplished Mr. Leo Ditrichstein, of Ferenc Molnar's "Das Märchen vom Wolf." Molnar's play is based upon the romantic thesis that every woman treasures in her heart of hearts an idealized, a glorified image of her first love: an image which persists, which is not dislodged by any subsequent attachments, even though she may marry happily—some one else. And surely it is among the strangest and most touching revelations of our humanity (as we have elsewhere observed) that there is no one so prosaic, so complacent, so alien to romance as not to bear in some inner chamber of the heart some secretly cherished portrait, perhaps dim with age, from which gazes a once beloved face—a chamber into which one looks, it may be every day, it may be but once in a decade, to dream a little, to long a little, perhaps to regret a little more. Is it not incredible, Molnar might say to us, that the eupeptic mistress of your neighbor's household—a blameless wife, an irreproachable mother, a pillar of the Ladies' Culture Club, a beacon of rectitude—should be in certain reminiscent hours a dream-haunted wanderer in enchanted woods, a silent worshiper in some temple whose hidden place is known only to her? So we see Louise—Louise, a happy wife and mother—dreaming of her girlhood's sweetheart, the ardent young Russian, Taticheff; we can almost hear her murmuring to herself in broken, Lesbian cadences,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> I loved thee,
> . . . of old time, once,
> . . . long since in old-time overpast."

But Molnar has the prophylactic gift of comic irony; so he shows you what happens, in nine cases out of ten, when the girl who has enshrined her early lover encounters him in the flesh in later life—when the man that was is confronted with the man that is. Dozing before her fire, Louise has splendid dreams of him; she visions him as a great general, a great statesman, a great singer. And note, by the way, the delicate justice, the rare fidelity, with which these dream passages are handled by the playwright; for they have the inconsequence, the abruptness of transition, the fluid quality of sleep-chasings; and note also the happy inspiration which has prompted Molnar to present these glorious visions as they would naturally appear to the crude and expansive imaginings of a young girl; the mighty general, as he tells her, rose from the ranks in less than a month; the statesman holds monarchs in the hollow of his hand, partitions empires, plays with the nations of the world as if he were overlord of the cosmos. And then—and then—Louise awakens, to meet the *real* Taticheff. Alas, he is no general, no statesman, no conquering artist; he is private secretary to an eminent traveling Russian—a most obsequious little man, politely servile, with his "yes, Ma*dame;* no, Ma*dame.*" He remembers Louise with difficulty; indeed, he is engaged to a girl at home in his native Russia, the daughter of a farmer who is rich in pigs.

Poor Louise! Her heart is rid of its cloudy dreams; she can laugh at them now; and, after all, is not her husband, though a little jealous, the best of men? And yet one cannot but wonder if, in some downcast hour, she does not say over to herself, with just a shade of bitterness,

> . . . I would not find;
> For when I find, I know
> I shall have clasped the wandering wind
> And built a house of snow."

A comedy of real substance, charm, wit, is this of Molnar's; and how delightfully, how satisfyingly, it is produced and acted at the Belasco! Here again we have, in the Louise of Miss Crews and the Taticheff (in his five incarnations) of Mr. Ditrichstein, acting, in the vein of high comedy,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the most expert kind—full of insight, finesse, imagination, and technical dexterity. Particularly engrossing was the fivefold characterization of Mr. Ditrichstein—a performance worthy of Richard Mansfield.

To those who, after witnessing the performances which we have particularized in these notes, are not yet persuaded that excellent miming is still a very common thing on our stage, we would suggest further investigations: we would recommend that they observe the eloquent and distinguished acting of Miss Elsie Ferguson in Klaw and Erlanger and Mr. Frohman's production of Mr. Davies's "Outcast," at the Lyceum; of Mr. Faversham and Mr. Tearle (not to speak of the admirable French player, Mademoiselle Gabrielle Dorziat) in de Croisset's "The Hawk," at the Shubert; of Mr. Leon Quartermaine in Mr. Brady's production of Knoblauch's "My Lady's Dress," at the Playhouse; and of a dozen other players whom we could name if we had the requisite time and space. And when we can add that the inexhaustibly delectable Marie Tempest is now to be seen in repertoire, under the auspices of the Messrs. Shubert, at the Comedy, has it not been sufficiently indicated that histrionic capacity has scarcely as yet vanished wholly from our contemporary stage?

Why does the younger generation of our native composers persist in offering us, with so bland and childlike an unconsciousness, music which is so often merely a gesture of homage to the particular composer who happens to represent the prevailing musical fashion of the hour? It is, of course, easy to understand the attraction which a powerful creative mind must exercise over a youthful artist of sensibility: it is easy to understand why our youngsters caper so readily to-day to the piping of Debussy; but why do they exhibit their performances in public with so naïve a pride, as if they had learned the trick without a master? The other day an admirable singer of songs, Mr. Reinald Werrenrath, gave a concert at Æolian Hall in the course of which he sang a group of *Lieder* by certain of the junior American composers. There was not one of these songs that lacked certain valuable possessions; they displayed a measure of poetic and emotional sensibility, competent craftsmanship, a command of eloquent utterance, an occasional mastery of beauti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful speech. The sensibility and the craftsmanship it was a pleasure to recognize; it was much less of a pleasure to note that the eloquence and the beauty were in no case self-sprung: they were derivative. They were, chiefly, dilute Debussy. Now Debussy's music is interesting only when written by Debussy—as Debussy himself is interesting only when he is speaking his own native tongue: we have as strong a distaste for this great master when (as in some of the interludes of "Pelléas et Mélisande") his voice is the voice of Wagner, as we have for those accomplished young American song-writers who, with apparently naïve unconsciousness, speak the language of Debussy. It is simple justice to them to say that Europe, especially France, England, and Russia, is full of composers, both eminent and inconspicuous, who have adopted the unmistakable ways of Debussy as their own—fatuous and ineffectual Lilliputians who, with absurd and pavonine pride, strut about in the exquisite vestments of the unique musical personality of our time. Second-hand Debussy is just as unacceptable when we encounter it in the brilliant and ingenious Ravel as when it confronts us in the oddly ingenuous productions of our own modernistic young tone-poets.

Mr. Ernest Newman has said, with point and truth, that nothing can prevent composers of one country "assimilating, if they want to, the technical methods and the harmonic discoveries of composers of any other country." That is indisputable. MacDowell, for example, "assimilated" Wagner and Liszt and Grieg; but he also gave us—MacDowell. Let our young men be a little more brave and forthright: let them derive all the liberating and quickening impulses they can from Debussy, or from Strauss, or from Schönberg, or from any one else who can kindle their creative fires; but let them not forget for an instant that unless their music is personal, individual, self-sprung, it is less than nothing. The world does not want to hear their accounts of Debussy's soul; it wants to hear their accounts of their own. We would remind them of these lines from Swinburne's "In the Twilight":

> What if the morning awake
> Never of us to be seen?
> Yet, if we die, if we live,
> That which we have will we give.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH[1]

BY F. M. COLBY

In a queer, bashful little preface Mr. Havelock Ellis warns his readers away. This is in no sense a book, he says, but rather the loose sheets of a journal, which people are likely to find "too idiosyncratic and personal." From his preface you might suppose that the text of this volume had somehow slipped out inadvertently like an oath, though why in that case it should ever have got itself bound he does not explain—perhaps because in compact form it might the more easily escape detection. And, not content with apologies, he quotes the adverse comment of a friend that it lacks "explicit reasonableness," which, by the way, is an admirable illustration of a large and thriving body of contemporary criticism. For, this being quite obviously a book of random observations, thoughts, and half-thoughts, crotchets, hobbies, guesses, and whims, would from its very nature lack "explicit reasonableness." One may contend that a volume of "impressions" ought not to exist, but, granting its existence, one cannot reasonably blame the writer because he has not achieved something he did not aim at—for example, a history of Rome or a mathematical treatise. And this sort of fundamental misunderstanding accounts, I believe, for a very large part of current critical volubility, especially of the serious, academic sort, as when the judicious in the London *Athenæum* are grieving over some light person who is not as judicious as they. To this day, I suppose, there are hundreds of good souls complaining that Mr. Chesterton is not solidly instructive, and that Mr. H. G. Wells is a little too sweeping in some of his remarks. In actual life no one blames a cat for not being a cow, but in the cold austerity of the printed page I have seen Bernard Shaw

[1] *Impressions and Comments.* By Havelock Ellis. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston and New York. 1914.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condemned for the absence of qualities that would have made him a superintendent of the Chicago public schools or John Milton; and I have but just now been reading an uncommonly thorough and able treatise on Anatole France by a Frenchman who, after careful analysis, brings to light the damning fact that Anatole France is an altogether different person from Alphonse Daudet. Give these people a blond writer and they apply themselves with great skill, energy, and learning to the task of proving what a complete failure he really is as a brunette. If a sonnet set up to be a pocket dictionary, one might reasonably complain; still more, if the dictionary should endeavor gaily to perform the additional office of the sonnet; but that is not the spirit of this criticism. It is rather an attitude of mind, which, if logically maintained, would not permit the coexistence in this world of dictionaries and sonnets; for at the bottom of these critics' hearts is the detestation of diversity.

One day Mr. Ellis muses over a drunken woman and on another he descants on the evolution of furniture, having in the mean while declared his taste in architecture, the women of Normandy, the ugliness of modern civilization, and the music of Franck and Elgar, and his opinion of the devil, Cornishmen, George Meredith, Raphael, Gaby Deslys, war, and nakedness; and as he gives only a page or two to each of these matters, he naturally does not get to the bottom of any of them. He really accomplishes nothing beyond being suggestive, provocative, and entertaining, but he often displays these qualities in discussing subjects that would seem to have the least attraction for the human mind, for example, —the Archbishops of Canterbury.

November 20.—The Archbishop of Canterbury, I understand, has publicly expressed his approval of the application of the lash to those persons who are engaged in the so-called "White Slave Traffic." There is always a certain sociological interest in the public utterances of an Archbishop of Canterbury. He is a great State official who automatically registers the level of the public opinion of the respectable classes. The futility for deterrence or reform of the lash or other physical torture as applied to adults has long been a commonplace of historical criminology, and Collas, the standard historian of flagellation, pointing out that the lash can at best only breed the virtues of slavery, declares that "the history of flagellation is that of a moral bankruptcy."

. . . . . .

Is this love of torture, by the way, possibly one of the fruits of Empire? We see it in the Roman Empire, too, and how vigorously it was applied to Christians and other criminals. *Christianos ad leones!* But it was a dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

astrously unsuccessful policy—or we should not have an Archbishop of Canterbury with us now.

No disrespect for Archbishops of Canterbury is involved in this recognition of their public function, and I have no wish to be (as Laud wrote of one of my ancestors) "a very troublesome man" to archbishops. They act automatically for the measurement of society, merely in the same sense as an individual is automatically acting for the measurement of himself when he states how profoundly he admires Mendelssohn or R. L. Stevenson. He thereby registers the particular degree of his own spiritual state. And when an Archbishop of Canterbury, with all that sensitiveness to the atmosphere which his supreme office involves, publicly Professes an Opinion, he is necessarily registering a particular degree in the Spiritual State of Society. It is an important function which was never vouchsafed to his Master.

One wonders how many centuries it is since an Archbishop of Canterbury was known to express any public opinion on non-ecclesiastical affairs which was not that of the great majority of Respectable People. Of course in ecclesiastical matters, and in political matters which are ecclesiastical, he is professionally bound, and Beckett and Sudbury and Laud—though one was a victim to the hostility of a King, another to the hostility of the lower class, and the third to the middle class—were all faithful to the death to their profession and their class, as an Archbishop is bound to be, even when his profession and his class are in a minority; I speak of the things to which he is not so bound. I have no doubt that at some recent period an Archbishop has archiepiscopally blessed the Temperance Movement. He is opposed to drunkenness, because we all are, even Licensed Victuallers, and because drunkenness is fast dying out. But imagine an Archbishop of Canterbury preaching Temperance in the eighteenth century when nearly every one was liable to be drunk! He would have been mistaken for a Methodist. I must confess it would be to me a great satisfaction to find an Archbishop of Canterbury earnestly pleading in the House of Lords in favor of gambling, or the unrestricted opening of public houses on Sunday, or some relaxation in the prosecution of pornographic literature. Not by any means that I should agree with his point of view. But the spectacle offered of a morally courageous and intellectually independent Archbishop of Canterbury would be so stimulating, the presence of a Live Person at the head of the Church instead of a glorified Penny-in-the-Slot Machine would be so far-reaching in its results, that all questions of agreement and disagreement would sink into insignificance.

A few, a very few, of his papers are trivial, as, for example, when he rakes up a speech of Mr. Bryan's delivered over a dozen years before and forgotten by any man who has a decent control of his memory, and on the strength of it belabors the whole United States. And of all speeches in the world, it was the one with that "eloquent peroration," beginning, "Behold a republic resting upon the foundation stones quarried from the mountains of eternal truth," and repeating about a dozen times the same words, "Behold a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

republic,'' in the manner of epilepsy *loquax* and of oratory. At that epoch, as I remember, reading one of Mr. Bryan's speeches, the very next morning was like visiting the wings of the theater in the daytime, and while this is true in a measure of all oratory, I suppose there never was a son of thunder who quite so lamentably squeaked in print as Mr. Bryan in the campaign of 1899. Yet now at this long distance from the brass-bands and roarings and poundings and flag-flappings of that playful period comes this serious retort to a mere political intonation. To the sentiment that Columbia is the gem of the ocean Mr. Ellis replies, after fifteen years, that the speaker exaggerates. He says " the glare of rhapsodical eulogy " sets him thinking of the other side, but that is not the proper effect of " rhapsodical eulogy " on reasonable minds. On the contrary, it should stop their thinking altogether. Bombast after fifteen years ought surely to leave each human faculty in repose.

Most of his little commentaries, however, leave one with a regret that they end so soon, especially those on literary subjects. In a provokingly brief paper on " counters," after quoting Bacon's saying that " there is no Excellent Beauty that hath not some Strangeness in the Proportion " he discusses the great host of writers who turn beautiful things into " jarring vulgarisms." The " counter " is the word or phrase " which has lost the original contour of its mintage and become a mere featureless coin." When in journalism a party of fifteen persons have been " literally decimated," we may be sure a counter has been used. Even good writers catch the habit, and he instances Francis Thompson, who employed all sorts of archaisms, conventional inversions, and absurd neologisms—" like false antiques, all counters." Stevenson, he says, rejects counters, but that is about the only merit he allows Stevenson, who, according to him, is the " hollow image of a great writer," who after forming his style on great models found he had nothing to say and went on saying it, to the delight of the mob. People said, Behold, he writes beautifully, " and there is nothing inside him but sawdust, just like you and me." In the nineteenth century, he continues, good writing was for the most part self-conscious, lacking that union of dignity and familiarity which is essential to the art, and so after a few more large sayings or sharp ones, while the reader fairly aches for reasons and particulars, the paper ends like a tree

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a big stem stunted on a mountain-top—and that, by the way, is characteristic of many of them. Among his pet aversions are the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, clothes, civilization, London smoke, respectability, conventional modesty, Raphael, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and mobs. He feels kindly toward suffragettes, the devil, naked people, Cornishmen, Jacobean furniture, eugenics, Granville Barker's presentation of "Twelfth Night," and savages. Naturally in casual comments of this sort he cannot linger long with any of these matters, but he moves among them in an entertaining way, ejaculating.

Where is our great writer to-day? he asks, and goes on to say that if any writer deals frivolously with the King he goes to prison, and that if "he deals seriously with so much as a chambermaid's physical secrets off he goes to prison again." In conclusion, he tells us that we ought to feel pleased that we cannot sink lower, because now there is nothing left for us but to rise. "The tide turns at low water as well as at high."

When men past fifty write in this way, as they do so continually, I wonder whether a little inner voice does not whisper that there is only one reason for it in the world. Whether or not it is actually true that we have no great writer, whether literature is gone and the language dead, and the race bred out into baboons or lost in imbecility, nobody past fifty requires the existence of these sad conditions as an excuse. Being past fifty is his only real reason, and it is reason enough. Whether the present moment is the worst that ever was, no man can know, but he does know how he feels about it, and that sense of decline or extinguishment in the outside world is one of the inner necessities of middle age. It is by no means an unhappy frame of mind. One constantly meets men in middle life who are almost enthusiastic over the loss of their own appetites. Hoops and marbles and football and girls suffice for the day thereof, but the lusty sport of middle age is the cursing of contemporaneity. Never do the faces of old men at the club light up so beautifully with an inner joy as when agreeing that something or other is an outrage, or wondering with one accord what in the world we are coming to. It is strange that writers *de senectute* have so seldom celebrated the gaiety of detraction, the hearty, convivial pleasure of running things down.

Hence it must not be inferred that because Mr. Havelock

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ellis finds himself in an almost idiotic literary generation he feels in any wise depressed. On the contrary, he feels quite cheerful and perhaps a little distinguished; and, besides, he merely mentions the point in passing. He is soon absorbed in other pastimes equally comprehensive, as, for example, in wondering if "people were morally inverted, turned upside, with their vices above water and their respectabilities submerged," and "vice became respectable and the respectabilities vicious," whether, after all, the world would be any the worse. What, he asks, would be the difference? then washes his hands of the matter, and talks about the blessings of hostility.

F. M. Colby.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

WHAT CAN I KNOW? By GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD, LL.D. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914.

The man of learning who puts into a little book his best and most availably useful thought, so simply expressed that all who are intelligent, with or without technical training, may understand, does an eminently good thing. He does a thing that is, in the first place, of great practical use; for nowadays we need most of all the books that adequately sum up and interpret the great and growing mass of human knowledge. Volumes written to develop special theses, or to make public the results of particular investigations, do but form part of a sort of general conversation carried on by scholars and leisured thinkers, and such books are only secondarily educative. But the little books that sum up and interpret the conclusions of sound learning are educative in the highest degree. It is no mere affirmation of the fallacy that learning can be had ready-made, to say that such books may supply to thinking but time-pressed readers—and there are many of these—a part of the fruits of a university education, and perhaps the best part. More than this, a book like Dr. George Trumbull Ladd's *What Can I Know?*—a book that expresses sincere convictions and reveals to some extent the writer's own inward "cosmos"—has a real spiritual value. To say that Dr. Ladd's book may heal sick minds and characters is only to state the probability of its doing what, in fact, sound books are always doing. Is it not upon record that William James's writings have saved souls? And for the average mind, at least, Dr. Ladd's doctrines undoubtedly contain more that is clarifying and strengthening than do William James's.

Dr. Ladd approaches his subject as one seeking for practical light and leading. Illuminatingly he discusses the question of the limitations of human knowledge, the effects of heredity and of environment, including the opinions of others, everywhere deepening the significance of those lessons which common sense and experience teach with more or less thoroughness to the virtuous and the intelligent. Analyzing the process by which we know, he sums up his results in the notable saying that "*knowledge is a matter of the entire man*—the real knower is the whole self, not as a 'naked mind,' but as a living soul." Following up the discussion of the cognitive process with a chapter upon "Thinking One's Way through a Subject," he maintains the important doctrine that not *ideas,* but only *judgments,* are true or false; that our thinking, if it is to be of any real worth, must be, to borrow an excellent word from the vocabulary of Natty Bumppo, *judgmatical.* "Men who are continually proclaiming 'my idea' of this or that," writes Dr. Ladd, "unless one pardons them as unskilled in the use of English, or as thoughtless followers of a false psychology, are apt to be heard with con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt." The truth that lies back of this is one of the profoundest in philosophy: "All human science, all human faiths, all human conduct, assume, expand, confirm, the correlation between knowledge and reality." These are good words, and most of us would hear them with inward satisfaction even if they were unsupported by other argument. Further, the author explains the various degrees of certainty in knowledge, the value and danger of jumping at conclusions, and the fallibility of formal logic. His chapter on "The Worth and Way of Self-Knowledge" is almost as good for moderns as were the doctrines of Socrates for the young men of Athens, and certainly is as much needed. In this chapter, besides clarifying many other matters, Dr. Ladd shows in rather startling fashion how much scientific truth is expressed in such common sayings as "He is not the same man as he was twenty years ago," or, "Be a real man"; the cold fact being that "different men are real, self-same, and one with themselves in very different degrees."

If overmuch philosophizing have made us mad, Dr. Ladd's book will do much to restore us to sanity; if we are intellectually unambitious because we are muddled without knowing it, or because we are indolent so far as "subjective" thought is concerned, and consequently deficient in self-knowledge, the same book will help to rouse us to a deeper consciousness.

REMINISCENCES OF TOLSTOY. By HIS SON, COUNT ILYA TOLSTOY. New York: The Century Company, 1914.

Tolstoy—perhaps the man of most commanding character, of most widespread influence upon ethical thought and feeling, and of most interesting personality, who has lived into our time—is portrayed by his son with an affectionate frankness and an outspoken charm that place him in an entirely new and a most attractive light. Wholly uncontroversial in tone, and equally free from unfilial complaint and from special pleading, Count Ilya's book is the most effective preventive of superficial or sneering criticisms of his father that could have been composed. For it shows Tolstoy as a father, as a husband, as a man among other men, as a keen and gentle humorist—it shows, indeed, the real man.

The volume is as remarkable for its illustrations as for its text, and there is such a harmony between the two that it may not be amiss to speak of the pictures first, as the more immediately striking. There is one photograph, in particular, which shows the Tolstoy family at dinner: the two central figures might almost have been transferred from the canvas of an Italian religious painter; the remaining figures may strongly remind us—particularly if we happen to be of New England ancestry—of our own great-aunts and great-uncles and old family friends. Now this is precisely the note of the whole book—the servant in the house, the saint in the family—*our* family—and yet the man. Again and again we are made to feel what we often do feel in connection with Russian memoirs—that the Russian people, however sharply differing from us in national and institutional mind, are the most like us of any race in the thought and feeling of every day. The points wherein they differ from and excel us are self-knowledge, its concomitant insight into human nature, and the power of self-expression; but these faculties are the very ones that enable them to paint pictures of life in which we recognize a resemblance to ourselves.

Perhaps the most engaging trait of his father that Count Ilya reveals is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that combination of sympathy and delicate pleasantry in dealing with children which is characteristic of the men natively gifted for the rôle of father. At one time the children were engaged in reading a very long, dull, and pointless English novel, "of which," says Count Ilya, "all that I now remember is that the hero once remarked, 'I am lonely and bored.'" The children—with that imaginative daring and enterprise which youngsters so often have and then mysteriously lose—proceeded to dramatize the story and play it out with paper dolls for actors. Tolstoy, observing them, cut out from an illustrated paper a man who was entirely pink. "This," said he, "is Adolphe." And promptly Adolphe was given a part; he became, indeed, so essential that the story would have seemed wholly pointless without him as hero.

It is this sort of thing that draws us closest to the great man, and there is rather more of this than there is of discussion concerning what may be called the conventional points of interest in Tolstoy's life. It is better to learn of his clairvoyance in dealing with his children and friends—and to realize thereby that literary insight is not merely a trick of the imagination, but a faculty of the soul—than to read of his habits of literary composition; though we read of these, too. In speaking of his father's attitude toward persons outside the family, as well as those within it, Count Ilya evinces a racial subtlety and warm-heartedness. He shows, for instance, that Tolstoy and Turgenyef loved each other so well that they could by no means be content with relations of ordinary good will, yet that they differed so violently in temperament and intellect that their attempts to draw closer together invariably resulted in quarrels. Turgenyef was always complaining of Tolstoy's "waste" of his great literary powers. "Lyof Tolstoy," he wrote in 1860, "continues to play the crank. It was evidently written in his stars. When will he turn his final somersault and stand on his feet at last?" He could neither contentedly allow his friend to go his own way, nor subdue his own great mind even for a moment to the other's, as great or greater.

What Count Ilya makes plain regarding his father's change of heart—the change that transformed the "former jovial and high-spirited ringleader and companion of his children" into the stern and censorious propagandist—is that Tolstoy suffered severely not only in conscience (as the fanatic and born self-tormentor suffer), but as keenly in his affections, and (as the normal man suffers) through the suppression of that part of himself that loved ease, humor, joyousness, a well-ordered life—all that constitutes *pleasantness* or *happiness*, but not *blessedness*. A new light is thrown upon the motives of Tolstoy's "flight" near the end of his life, and it is suggested, among other things, that if his youngest son, "Vanitchka," had lived, much might have been different.

Hardly can one begin to know Tolstoy's character justly without reading Count Ilya's book.

THE SUNNY SIDE OF DIPLOMATIC LIFE. By MADAME DE HEGERMANN-LINDENCRONE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1914.

To live a full, rich, and varied life, actively combining the social and intellectual elements; to know great affairs, the humor and the humors of the great; to "fit in" everywhere and yet to be always oneself—this can be the lot of but few mortals. How to do all this with sufficient seriousness and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet with gaiety, with unfailing zest, is a secret that some women possess. No man could have revealed to us the sunny side of diplomatic life as Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone has done; no man could have touched its humors without being a bit satirical, nor its formalities without being a trifle heavy; and no masculine writer could have set forth the multitude of social and personal incidents which Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone relates without being in an undesirable sense gossipy. Above all, one is struck with the thought that few men and hardly a woman could have written such a record as *The Sunny Side of Diplomatic Life* without imparting to it a little too much of the temper of the *laudator temporis acti,* or at least a shade of melancholy. That there is nothing of this in Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone's story is primarily due, no doubt, to the fact that it is made up of letters written soon after the occurrences which they describe. But, then, who else could have written the letters? These, even the earliest of them, are not in the least—shall we say, old-fashioned? Those which belong to the opening chapters of Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone's earlier book, *In the Courts of Memory,* are almost as witty and as incisively thoughtful as are the later epistles; the latter are no less delightful in their persistent youthfulness and buoyancy; and both are sprightly with the interest one may feel at its best only for a brief period—when one is at the pleasurable task of thinking over and storing away recent events for the purpose of making them part of oneself. But this freshness of color—the freshness with which to-day paints the scenes of yesterday—is far from wholly explaining the effect of Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone's letters. The truth is, she possesses in a high degree that supreme art of the descriptive letter-writer—the art of making her readers feel themselves a part of the occurrences described. And how can we feel that things are unreal through age or distance when we are made to feel ourselves one with them?

Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone was Miss Lily Greenough, of Cambridge, where she lived with her grandfather, Judge Fay, in the old Fay mansion now the property of Radcliffe College. Gifted with a remarkable singing voice, she was taken, when only fifteen years old, to London, to study under Garcia. From that time on her life has been highly cosmopolitan, though in all that she has written there is an American frankness and liveliness, and another quality as well—a touch of idealism combined with sweet reasonableness, strongly suggestive of the old New England days when she came directly under the influence of such men as Longfellow and Agassiz. At the age of seventeen she became the wife of Charles Moulton, an American resident of Paris who had been, in the fullest and best sense, a Parisian since the days of Louis Philippe. As Mrs. Charles Moulton she knew all that was best worth knowing in the traditionally gayest and certainly most intellectually stimulating of the world's great cities. After the fall of the Empire and her husband's death, Mrs. Moulton returned to America, to become, a few years later, the wife of M. de Hegermann-Lindencrone, who was at that time Danish Minister to the United States, and later represented his country successively at Stockholm, Rome, Paris, and Berlin. It is at a time shortly after her marriage that Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone begins her narrative in *The Sunny Side of Diplomatic Life,* giving us first of all an impression of social life in Washington as it was in 1875, toward the close of Grant's second administration. In this, and in a subsequent part of the narrative which relates a journey to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western coast—a chapter wherein the gentlemanly Buffalo Bill, the California millionaires, with their fire-new wealth and culture, and many other diversely interesting personalities appear—we see American life through the eyes of a critic thoroughly American in spirit and understanding, yet foreign enough in point of view to see with keen discrimination; just as in the subsequent part of the story, which tells of the life of European courts and intellectual circles, we are always aware that we are being addressed by one of our own countrywomen, cosmopolitan and thoroughly identified with the society about her as she always appears to be. Monarchs, statesmen, artists, musicians, and writers, all seem to have revealed something of their intimate selves to Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone, and she has perceived and rendered for our benefit the salient social traits of each. In her acquaintance with musicians, she was particularly blessed; personal recollections of nearly all the great ones—including Liszt, Verdi, and Saint-Saëns—form no small part of her store of luminous memories. It is the privilege of such a writer as Madame de Hegermann-Lindencrone to write with real naturalness and to include within the limits of one book the most diverse matters, telling us on one page of a young Dane whose Boston landlady kept a full-grown lion confined in her front parlor, and on another of how Mascagni appeared, dazed and shabby, before the curtain after the first performance of the "Cavalleria Rusticana." Whatever she tells us is marked with that stamp of unity which is conferred by a clear intelligence and a lively, independent personality.

LUCAS' ANNUAL. Edited by E. V. LUCAS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

To publish between modern covers a collection of literary stuff resembling those delightful old rag-bags of information, fiction, and poetry—called "annuals" because the publishers might do it again next year, if they saw fit—was a merry conceit, of which we enjoy the flavor. Moreover, *Lucas' Annual* for 1914 contains a varied selection of the curious, the beautiful, and the untrue—and some truth. Still, perhaps we care less, on the whole, for the semi-professional pleasantries of literary men, the chips from their workshops, their sometimes labored wit presented with an air of spontaneity, than do our English cousins. At best we can say only that the contents of *Lucas' Annual* are not half bad.

J. M. Barrie seems rather ill-represented by the sketch "Old Hyphen"—supposedly written by a schoolboy. Somehow, in fiction, English school life achieves a dignity and seriousness that American school life lacks, while the humor of the English schoolboy is likely to strike us as alien and a little tiresome. The other modern contributors seem all to suffer a little from self-consciousness, coupled in some cases with rather an excess of manner. However, "Saki's" parody on the modern discursive drama is really funny, and Leacock's satire on "The Thousand-Guinea Prize Novel" hits home to us. There is other good stuff, too, including some really excellent verse. Among the modern authors represented are Barrie, Bennett, Dobson, Galsworthy, Hewlett, Leacock, F. Austen, Saki, and Mr. Lucas himself.

So far as truth is concerned, the core of the book is a letter from Ruskin to Browning in which Ruskin criticizes Browning's *Men and Women* "with a vengeance." This is an edifying and cheering human document. How

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human a great man can be—when he reads Browning! How little, after all, a great man may understand of what is unintelligible to the rest of us! How simply, after all, and gropingly, and in the manner of a schoolboy construing Virgil, may a great man read Browning! It is all very reassuring. We need no longer feel that our inability to understand Browning is due to a certain obtuseness in taking plain hints that certainly seem to be there, or to an annoying failure to grasp a grammatical sense that just eludes us. We do not wholly understand Browning? Very good! Neither did Ruskin, who tried his best. Further, it should be noted that the miscellany contains certain hitherto unpublished letters of R. L. S.—some youthful and ingenuous, others mature and not extraordinarily clever.

If any man desires to give himself the comfortable sensation of being literary in an old-fashioned way and of being something of a patron of letters, let him go out and buy a copy of *Lucas' Annual;* it would be a rather good thing to do.

MEMORIALS OF EMINENT YALE MEN. By ANSON PHELPS STOKES. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1914.

Not only do the two large volumes of Mr. Stokes's monumental work contain much information interesting to the world at large—brief biographies of great men written with elegant compactness and with a propriety and warmth of feeling not often found in those colder biographical writings that are uninfused with college loyalty—but they form a massive testimony to the worth and reality of college spirit and college ideals. In them one senses the real American college as a spiritual commonwealth. That a man should feel proud that he was graduated from the same college as Jonathan Edwards; that he should on this account feel nearer to Edwards in mind and character, is proof of the solid reality of the sentiment that so often degenerates into maudlin or thoughtless enthusiasm. If our greatest theologian had been educated by private tutors he might have written the very works he did write, but his influence, during his life and posthumously, would have been far less than it has been, all for lack of connection with a living institution that passes on its life from generation to generation.

Mr. Stokes has classified his eminent men according to their careers, as divines, men of letters, scholars, statesmen, scientists, artists, and the like, and has selected for treatment under each head only such men as were really eminent. Famous names occur very frequently in the record—men of whose college experiences, in particular, we are glad to know something. In men of letters, as the author concedes, Yale makes relatively the poorest showing, though among her sons, as we are prone to forget, are James Fenimore Cooper and Nathaniel Parker Willis, as well as Donald Grant Mitchell, the author of *Reveries of a Bachelor,* Edmund Clarence Stedman, and Edward Rowland Sill. In other departments names universally known—names such as Noah Webster, Samuel F. P. Morse, Eli Whitney, Samuel Tilden—are numerous. In the three concluding chapters the author illuminatingly discusses historic influences at Yale, the common characteristics of most Yale men, and the place and influence of historic universities in a democracy.

As good biographical reading and as reliable sources of information these two volumes may be rather specially recommended; for they represent not merely the perfunctory performance of a task, but earnest and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skilful literary work expended upon a theme of great richness. To each of the principal biographical sketches is appended a letter or other document written by the subject of the sketch.

JAPAN TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW. By HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

"The endeavor of the East," writes Hamilton Wright Mabie, "has been to identify unity with uniformity; the problem of the West is to discover unity in variety." This, he thinks, expresses the most radical difference between the two civilizations—a difference, however, that is far from constituting an insurmountable obstacle; for, indeed, between two such races as the Japanese and the Americans the resemblances are deeper than the differences. To help on a better understanding between these two peoples is the obvious intent of Mr. Mabie's book, *Japan To-day and To-morrow*, and this purpose is carried out so far as sympathetic thought and a mature skill in the art of pleasant description can effect it.

If we have aught to complain of, it is that the book is a bit too uniformly pleasant to permit of much sharp thinking, though here and there we meet with an illuminating passage. Mr Mabie, in effect, accuses us of some rather superficial views of Japan, as when he asks, with rhetorical intent, if we are to regard the Japanese as unscrupulous schemers or as picturesque figures out of the past. Of course not! Again our deeper questions too often go unanswered. We are quite willing to be persuaded that Shintoism is a good faith to live by, and in its way a beautiful faith. So is Buddhism; so are most faiths. What we yearn to know, however, is the real cause that makes the Japanese live up so fully to the faith that is in them as in many striking instances they appear to do. More definitely enlightening are Mr. Mabie's observations regarding the Japanese hand—"sinewy, flexible, sensitive, as unlike the big, potential, unlined hand of the untrained races as the faces of rudimentary peoples are unlike the faces of highly cultivated peoples"—and upon the Japanese face, which is shown to be not at all Mongolian.

In describing the triumphs of Japanese art and architecture—such artistic creations as the Temple of Kwannon and the Great Buddha—Mr. Mabie exercises practised skill; and his portrayals of nature, particularly his account of Japan's great Inland Sea, have something of real poetic fascination.

Any one who has received from general reading rather a slight impression of Japan's actuality, or of the attractive side of her civilization, may spend a profitable hour over this book of Mr. Mabie's. The volume contains a chapter reproducing a conversation with Count Okuma, who is well characterized as "a man of the old order with a modern mind."

WHY THE DOLLAR IS SHRINKING. By IRVING FISHER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

It is a pleasure rarely experienced to read so compact, shapely, and thorough a discussion of a much-discussed problem—a problem, moreover, upon which clear thinking is of both national and personal importance—as Professor Irving Fisher's study of the present high cost of living.

In his preliminary analysis of the nature of the problem, the author ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plains the elementary ideas of his subject patiently but not tediously. The "equation of exchange," for instance, he first defines in ordinary terms; then he expresses it mathematically, and then he further elucidates it by a mechanical illustration. Taking the various terms of the equation into account one by one, showing the effect upon any one of changes in one or more of the others, and allowing for all possible disturbing causes, Professor Fisher reaches the conclusion—a conclusion from which there seems no escape—that the rise of prices all over the world since 1896 can be fully explained by nothing else than an increase in the quantity of money. That the use of bank-notes and checks would not vitally affect the problem in any way might appear obvious enough to be taken for granted, but the author is resolved to leave no loophole for the entrance of error, and he shows the relation of credit currency to "real" money with a clearness and minuteness that imprint the fundamental truths indelibly upon the mind. Indeed, having made his subject tractable, through proper definitions and distinctions, Professor Fisher is able to demonstrate his conclusions with almost mathematical completeness, though he uses little mathematics and few really technical terms. His power of making ideas clear by means of analogies—the special gift of a skilful teacher—is constantly put to good use; as when he tells us that "we cannot assume that the rise of a particular price pulls up the general level of prices with it any more than we can assume that a man who walks up-stairs pulls the earth up with him. The man, in fact, pushes the earth down an infinitesimal distance, and the center of gravity of himself and the earth together remains unaffected." Many of the popular explanations of the high cost of living are proved by Professor Fisher to be fallacious—for instance, the theory that the prime causes are luxury and extravagance. These influences are, in fact, no more powerful now than they have been in the past, and the present prevalence, for instance, of automobiles is merely significant of wealth and invention. Extravagance, indeed, is in part the consequence of the rise in prices, and not at all its cause; for the tendency of high prices is to increase the amount of money in the hands of an easy-spending class.

By writing this book Professor Fisher has deserved the gratitude of the seldom-heard-from, but very real and thoroughly intelligent "man in the street."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"OUR HONOR *WITHOUT* SHAME WITH JAPAN"

October 20, 1914.

SIR,—In the October REVIEW there is a very interesting article by Mr. William Elliot Griffis on "Our Honor and Shame with Japan." Mr. Griffis makes certain statements to which, it seems to me, your attention should be called.

Referring to the recent act of the Legislature of California, relative to the ownership of land by aliens, Mr. Griffis, on page 569, says:

"As a nation and Government we signed a covenant which one State has violated."

"A sectional agitation, in favor of a reversal of our ancient friendship and the violation of treaties, has resulted in one State in a defiance of the Constitution of the United States."

"The recent hostile anti-Japanese legislation in California—race hatred in its most immoral form—violates in spirit and letter the treaty with Japan."

"To violate a treaty is to break the supreme law of the land, and trample on the Constitution of the United States."

The United States Supreme Court in Chirac *v.* Chirac, 2 Wheat. 259, said:

"The power of aliens to hold real estate is regulated by the laws of the State, except in so far as it may be affected by treaties with foreign countries."

In Beard *v.* Rowan, 9 Peters, 301, the United States Supreme Court held that:

"The condition upon which real estate may be held by aliens is a matter resting entirely with the State Legislature." That is, of course, subject to treaty provisions.

When the Legislature of California came to deal with this question last year it enacted a law the second section of which reads as follows:

"All aliens, other than those mentioned in Section I. of this act, may acquire, possess, enjoy, and transfer real property, or any interest therein, in this State, in the manner and to the extent and for the purposes prescribed by any treaty now existing between the Government of the United States and the nation or country of which such alien is a citizen or subject, and not otherwise, and may in addition thereto lease lands in this State for agricultural purposes for a term not exceeding three years."

It will be seen by this that the Legislature of California, in dealing with this question of alien ownership and occupation of lands, has, instead of violating the treaty, distinctly stated that the rights of the aliens

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

described shall be in accordance with the rights conferred by the treaty, and in addition there shall be other rights: that is, not less than the treaty gives, but more!

It is difficult to understand what Mr. Griffis meant when he stated that by this act we have "violated a treaty" and "trampled on the Constitution of the United States." The United States Government having entered into a treaty with another power, conferring upon citizens of that power certain privileges within the United States, the State of California has, by appropriate legislation, provided that the rights conferred by the treaty shall become part of the statute law of the State of California, and that, in addition to the rights enumerated by the treaty, citizens of the power named in the treaty shall have further and additional rights in the State of California. This act of our Legislature is referred to as part of the "Shame" with which we have fulfilled our duties to Japan.

It is difficult to perceive of any way by which California could have shown herself more submissive to the authority of the United States than by this specific act of her Legislature.

It is unquestionably true that a treaty made under the authority of the United States is the supreme law of the land, and that the Legislature of California cannot, in any possible way, put into effect any law contrary to that treaty; therefore it is difficult to understand how any law of California is breaking the supreme law of the land or "trampling" on the Constitution of the United States. It is quite obvious that there might be differences of opinion regarding the exact nature of the rights conferred by treaty upon the nationals of the various powers with which the United States has made treaties, but this much is certain, that the rights conferred by a treaty made under the authority of the United States cannot be taken away by any act of the Legislature; the Legislature of California did not undertake to enumerate or define the rights that were conferred by the treaty, but simply enacted that whatever those rights are, they should be recognized in California as part of our statute law, and, in addition, further rights should be conferred. How could the people of California more fully make known their complete and hearty recognition and approval of the treaty rights of Japan than by having the Legislature make the provisions of the treaty part of the statute law of the State?

On page 570 Mr. Griffis says, referring to Article VI. of the Constitution of the United States:

"In that august document no provision is more strongly safeguarded against any and all theories of Federalism and State rights, and none is more immune from alteration or the effects of attempted nullification or secession, by States, by judges, courts, legislators, and the politicians."

If the word "legislators," as here used, includes Congress, which is undoubtedly a body of legislators, Mr. Griffis is quite in error, because the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly held that Congress has the power to abrogate treaties. A treaty is no more the supreme law of the land than the laws of the United States, and Congress has repeatedly passed laws which have abrogated existing treaties, and the United States Supreme Court has always maintained that Congress has this power.

In Thomas *v.* Gay, 169 U. S., 262, the United States Supreme Court said:

"It is well settled that an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty, and that any questions that may arise are beyond the sphere of judicial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cognizance and must be met by the political department of the government."

"An act of Congress is not unconstitutional because it supersedes a prior treaty."—Stephens *v.* Cherokee Nation, 174 U. S., 445.

It was fully maintained by many high legal authorities that our treaty with England was violated when Congress by law provided for the free use of the Panama Canal by our coasting vessels, but no one contended that the Act of Congress was therefore unconstitutional.

It will, therefore, be seen that when Mr. Griffis says that no provision is more strongly safeguarded against attempted nullification by legislators than the provision making treaties the supreme law of the land, he is not in agreement with the Supreme Court of the United States, for that august tribunal has repeatedly held that the legislators in Congress may do just that very thing.

On page 573, Mr. Griffis asks:

"Shall we keep faith and respect our own supreme law of the land?"

I would suggest in answer to this question that so far as California is concerned, having made the provisions of the treaty part of her statute law, it is quite probable that she intends to respect it.

Yours very truly,

"CALIFORNIA."

LOS ANGELES, CAL.

APPRECIATION

November 4, 1914.

SIR,—I think THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has taken the position in the country equal to the old *Harper's Weekly*. For a great number of years I have always taken a great interest in any articles written by Mr. George Harvey, and he has certainly revivified THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and I believe has made it one of the most popular magazines in the country.

The personal influence of a man like you, Colonel Harvey, is a great asset to any paper, and in addition to that it is a great asset to any country to have a man with such a clear sense to dissect our foibles and also the good traits of our American citizens.

W. A. SADD.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED